Asia's Transformations

The Politics of Protection Rackets in Post-New Order Indonesia

Coercive capital, authority and street politics

Ian Douglas Wilson

ROUTLEDGE

Murdoch

UNIVERSITY

The Politics of Protection Rackets in Post-New Order Indonesia

Gangs and militias have been a persistent feature of social and political life in Indonesia. During the authoritarian New Order regime they constituted part of a vast network of sub-contracted coercion and social control on behalf of the state. Indonesia's subsequent democratisation has seen gangs adapt to and take advantage of the changed political context. New types of populist street-based organisations have emerged that combine predatory rent seeking with claims of representing marginalised social and economic groups.

Based on extensive fieldwork in Jakarta, this book provides a comprehensive analysis of the changing relationship between gangs, militias and political power and authority in post-New Order Indonesia. It argues that gangs and militias have manufactured various types of legitimacy in consolidating localised territorial monopolies and protection economies. As mediators between the informal politics of the street and the world of formal politics they have become often influential brokers in Indonesia's decentralised electoral democracy. More than mere criminal extortion, it is argued that the protection racket as a social relation of coercion and domination remains a salient feature of Indonesia's post-authoritarian political landscape.

This ground-breaking study will be of interest to students and scholars of Indonesian and Southeast Asian politics, political violence, gangs and urban politics.

Ian Douglas Wilson is a Lecturer in Politics and Security Studies at the School of Management and Governance, and a Research Fellow at the Asia Research Centre, Murdoch University, Australia.

Asia's Transformations
Edited by Mark Selden, Cornell University, USA

The books in this series explore the political, social, economic and cultural consequences of Asia's transformations in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The series emphasizes the tumultuous interplay of local, national, regional and global forces as Asia bids to become the hub of the world economy. While focusing on the contemporary, it also looks back to analyse the antecedents of Asia's contested rise.

This series comprises several strands:
Titles include:

1. **Debating Human Rights***
   Critical essays from the United States and Asia
   Edited by Peter Van Ness

2. **Hong Kong's History***
   State and society under colonial rule
   Edited by Tak-Wing Ngo

3. **Japan's Comfort Women***
   Sexual slavery and prostitution during World War II and the US occupation
   Yuki Tanaka

4. **Opium, Empire and the Global Political Economy***
   Carl A. Trocki

5. **Chinese Society***
   Change, conflict and resistance
   Edited by Elizabeth J. Perry and Mark Selden

6. **Mao's Children in the New China***
   Voices from the Red Guard generation
   Yarong Jiang and David Ashley

7. **Remaking the Chinese State***
   Strategies, society and security
   Edited by Chien-min Chao and Bruce J. Dickson

8. **Korean Society***
   Civil society, democracy and the state
   Edited by Charles K. Armstrong

9. **The Making of Modern Korea***
   Adrian Buzo

10. **The Resurgence of East Asia***
    500, 150 and 50 Year perspectives
    Edited by Giovanni Arrighi, Takeshi Hamashita and Mark Selden

11. **Chinese Society, second edition***
    Change, conflict and resistance
    Edited by Elizabeth J. Perry and Mark Selden

12. **Ethnicity in Asia***
    Edited by Colin Mackerras

13. **The Battle for Asia***
From decolonization to globalization
Mark T. Berger

14. **State and Society in 21st Century China***
Edited by Peter Hays Gries and Stanley Rosen

15. **Japan's Quiet Transformation***
Social change and civil society in the 21st century
Jeff Kingston

16. **Confronting the Bush Doctrine***
Critical views from the Asia-Pacific
Edited by Mel Gurtov and Peter Van Ness

17. **China in War and Revolution, 1895–1949***
Peter Zarrow

18. **The Future of US–Korean Relations***
The imbalance of power
Edited by John Feffer

19. **Working in China***
Ethnographies of labor and workplace transformations
Edited by Ching Kwan Lee

20. **Korean Society, second edition***
Civil society, democracy and the state
Edited by Charles K. Armstrong

21. **Singapore***
The state and the culture of excess
Souchou Yao

22. **Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History***
Colonialism, regionalism and borders
Edited by Sven Saaler and J. Victor Koschmann

23. **The Making of Modern Korea, 2nd Edition***
Adrian Buzo

24. **Re-writing Culture in Taiwan***
Edited by Fang-long Shih, Stuart Thompson, and Paul-François Tremlett

25. **Reclaiming Chinese Society***
The new social activism
Edited by You-tien Hsing and Ching Kwan Lee

26. **Girl Reading Girl in Japan***
Edited by Tomoko Aoyama and Barbara Hartley

27. **Chinese Politics***
State, society and the market
Edited by Peter Hays Gries and Stanley Rosen

28. **Chinese Society, third edition***
Change, conflict and resistance
Edited by Elizabeth J. Perry and Mark Selden

29. **Mapping Modernity in Shanghai**
Space, gender, and visual culture in the Sojourners' City, 1853–98
Samuel Y. Liang

30. **Minorities and Multiculturalism in Japanese Education**
An interactive perspective
Edited by Ryoko Tsuneyoshi, Kaori H Okano and Sarane Boocock

31. **Japan's Wartime Medical Atrocities**
Comparative inquiries in science, history, and ethics
Edited by Jing-Bao Nie, Nanyan Guo, Mark Selden and Arthur Kleinman

32. **State and Society in Modern Rangoon**
Donald M. Seekins

33. **Learning Chinese, Turning Chinese***
Becoming sinophone in a globalised world
Edward McDonald

34. **Aesthetic Constructions of Korean Nationalism**
Spectacle, politics and history
Hong Kal

35. **Popular Culture and the State in East and Southeast Asia**
Edited by Nissim Otmazgin and Eyal Ben Ari

36. **Japan's Outcaste Abolition**
The struggle for national inclusion and the making of the modern state
Noah Y. McCormack

37. **The Market and Temple Fairs of Rural China**
Red fire
Gene Cooper

38. **The Role of American NGOs in China's Modernization**
Invited influence
Norton Wheeler

39. **State, Society and the Market in Contemporary Vietnam**
Property, power and values
Edited by Hue-Tam Ho Tai and Mark Sidel

40. **East Asia Beyond the History Wars**
Confronting the ghosts of violence
Tessa Morris-Suzuki, Morris Low, Leonid Petrov and Timothy Yun Hui Tsu

41. **China**
How the empire fell
Joseph W. Esherick and C. X. George Wei

42. **The Political Economy of Affect and Emotion in East Asia**
Jie Yang

43. **Remaking China's Great Cities**
Space and culture in urban housing, renewal, and expansion
Samuel Y. Liang

44. **Vietnam's Socialist Servants**
Domesticity, class, gender, and identity
Minh T. N. Nguyen

45. **The San Francisco System and Its Legacies**
Continuation, transformation and historical reconciliation in the Asia-Pacific
Edited by Kimie Hara

46. **Transnational Trajectories in East Asia**
Nation, citizenship and region
Edited by Yasemin Nuhoğlu Soysal

47. **The Politics of Protection Rackets in Post-New Order Indonesia**
Coercive capital, authority and street politics
Ian Douglas Wilson

48. **Coal Mining Women in Japan**
Heavy Burdens
Donald W. Burton

Asia's Great Cities

Each volume aims to capture the heartbeat of the contemporary city from multiple perspectives emblematic of the authors own deep familiarity with the distinctive faces of the city, its history, society, culture, politics and economics, and its evolving position in national, regional and global frameworks. While most volumes emphasize urban developments since the Second World War, some pay close attention to the legacy of the longue durée in shaping the contemporary. Thematic and comparative volumes address such themes as urbanization, economic and financial linkages, architecture and space, wealth and power, gendered relationships, planning and anarchy, and ethnographies in national and regional perspective. Titles include:

1. **Bangkok***
Place, practice and representation
Marc Askew

2. **Representing Calcutta***
Modernity, nationalism and the colonial uncanny
Swati Chattopadhyay

3. **Singapore***
Wealth, power and the culture of control
Carl A. Trocki

4. **The City in South Asia**
James Heitzman

5. **Global Shanghai, 1850–2010***
A history in fragments
Jeffrey N. Wasserstrom

6. **Hong Kong***
Becoming a global city
Stephen Chiu and Tai-Lok Lui

Asia.com is a series which focuses on the ways in which new information and communication technologies are influencing politics, society and culture in Asia. Titles include:

1. **Japanese Cybercultures***
   Edited by Mark McLelland and Nanette Gottlieb
2. **Asia.com***
   Asia encounters the Internet
   Edited by K. C. Ho, Randolph Kluver and Kenneth C. C. Yang
4. **The Internet in Indonesia's New Democracy***
   David T. Hill and Krishna Sen
5. **Chinese Cyberspaces***
   Technological changes and political effects
   Edited by Jens Damm and Simona Thomas
6. **Mobile Media in the Asia-Pacific**
   Gender and the art of being mobile
   Larissa Hjorth
7. **Online@AsiaPacific**
   Mobile, social and locative media in the Asia–Pacific
   Larissa Hjorth and Michael Arnold

Literature and Society

Literature and Society is a series that seeks to demonstrate the ways in which Asian Literature is influenced by the politics, society and culture in which it is produced. Titles include:

1. **The Body in Postwar Japanese Fiction**
   Douglas N. Slaymaker
2. **Chinese Women Writers and the Feminist Imagination, 1905–1948***
   Haiping Yan
3. **Okinawan War Memory**
   Transgenerational trauma and the war fiction of Medoruma Shun
   Kyle Ikeda

Routledge Studies in Asia's Transformations

Routledge Studies in Asia's Transformations is a forum for innovative new research intended for a high-level specialist readership. Titles include:

1. **The American Occupation of Japan and Okinawa***
   Literature and memory
   Michael Molasky
2. **Koreans in Japan***
   Critical voices from the margin
   Edited by Sonia Ryang

3. **Internationalizing the Pacific**
The United States, Japan and the Institute of Pacific Relations in war and peace, 1919–1945
Tomoko Akami

4. **Imperialism in South East Asia***
'A fleeting, passing phase'
Nicholas Tarling

5. **Chinese Media, Global Contexts***
Edited by Chin-Chuan Lee

6. **Remaking Citizenship in Hong Kong***
Community, nation and the global city
Edited by Agnes S. Ku and Ngai Pun

7. **Japanese Industrial Governance**
Protectionism and the licensing state
Yul Sohn

8. **Developmental Dilemmas***
Land reform and institutional change in China
Edited by Peter Ho

9. **Genders, Transgenders and Sexualities in Japan***
Edited by Mark McLelland and Romit Dasgupta

10. **Fertility, Family Planning and Population Policy in China***
Edited by Dudley L. Poston, Che-Fu Lee, Chiung-Fang Chang, Sherry L. McKibben and Carol S. Walther

11. **Japanese Diasporas***
Unsung pasts, conflicting presents and uncertain futures
Edited by Nobuko Adachi

12. **How China Works***
Perspectives on the twentieth-century industrial workplace
Edited by Jacob Eyferth

13. **Remolding and Resistance among Writers of the Chinese Prison Camp**
Disciplined and published
Edited by Philip F. Williams and Yenna Wu

14. **Popular Culture, Globalization and Japan***
Edited by Matthew Allen and Rumi Sakamoto

15. **medi@sia***
Global media/tion in and out of context
Edited by Todd Joseph Miles Holden and Timothy J. Scrase

16. **Vientiane***
Transformations of a Lao landscape
Marc Askew, William S. Logan and Colin Long

17. **State Formation and Radical Democracy in India**
Manali Desai

18. **Democracy in Occupied Japan***
The U.S. occupation and Japanese politics and society
Edited by Mark E. Caprio and Yoneyuki Sugita

19. **Globalization, Culture and Society in Laos***
Boike Rehbein

20. **Transcultural Japan***
At the borderlands of race, gender, and identity
Edited by David Blake Willis and Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu

21. **Post-Conflict Heritage, Post-Colonial Tourism**
Culture, politics and development at Angkor
Tim Winter

22. **Education and Reform in China***
Emily Hannum and Albert Park

23. **Writing Okinawa: Narrative Acts of Identity and Resistance**
Davinder L. Bhowmik

24. **Maid in China***
Media, morality, and the cultural politics of boundaries
Wanning Sun

25. **Northern Territories, Asia-Pacific Regional Conflicts and the Åland Experience**
Untying the Kurillian knot
Edited by Kimie Hara and Geoffrey Jukes

26. **Reconciling Indonesia**
Grassroots agency for peace
Birgit Bräuchler

27. **Singapore in the Malay World***
Building and breaching regional bridges
Lily Zubaidah Rahim

28. **Pirate Modernity***
Delhi's media urbanism
Ravi Sundaram

29. **The World Bank and the post-Washington Consensus in Vietnam and Indonesia**
Inheritance of loss
Susan Engel

30. **China on Video**
Smaller Screen Realities
Paola Voci

31. **Overseas Chinese, Ethnic Minorities and Nationalism**
De-centering China
Elena Barabantseva

32. **The Education of Migrant Children and China's Future**
The urban left behind
Holly H. Ming

Critical Asian Scholarship

Critical Asian Scholarship is a series intended to showcase the most important individual contributions to scholarship in Asian Studies. Each of the volumes presents a leading Asian scholar addressing themes that are central to his or her most significant and lasting contribution to Asian studies. The series is committed to the rich variety of research and writing on Asia, and is not restricted to any particular discipline, theoretical approach or geographical expertise.

1. **Southeast Asia***
   A testament
   George McT. Kahin

2. **Women and the Family in Chinese History***
   Patricia Buckley Ebrey

3. **China Unbound***
   Evolving perspectives on the Chinese past
   Paul A. Cohen

4. **China's Past, China's Future***
   Energy, food, environment
   Vaclav Smil

5. **The Chinese State in Ming Society***
   Timothy Brook

6. **China, East Asia and the Global Economy***
   Regional and historical perspectives
   Takeshi Hamashita
   Edited by Mark Selden and Linda Grove

7. **The Global and Regional in China's Nation-Formation***
   Prasenjit Duara

8. **Decoding Subaltern Politics***
   Ideology, disguise, and resistance in agrarian politics
   James C. Scott

9. **Mapping China and Managing the World***
   Culture, cartography and cosmology in late Imperial times
   Richard J. Smith

10. **Technology, Gender and History in Imperial China***
    Great transformations reconsidered
    Francesca Bray

* Available in paperback

The Politics of Protection Rackets in Post-New Order Indonesia

Coercive capital, authority and street politics

Ian Douglas Wilson

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2015
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2015 Ian Douglas Wilson

The right of Ian Douglas Wilson to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
A catalog record for this title has been requested.

ISBN: 978-0-415-56912-5 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-203-79919-2 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Taylor & Francis Books

Contents

	Acknowledgments	xv
	Preface	xvi
	Structure of the book	xix
	Methodology	xxii
1	Protection, violence and the state	1
2	Reconfigured rackets: Continuity, change and consolidation	20
3	A New Order of crime: Suharto's racket regime	37
4	The changing of the *preman* guard	61
5	The rise of the Betawi	90
6	Jakarta's political economy of rackets	114
7	Coercive capital, political entrepreneurship and electoral democracy	143
8	Conclusion: The politics of protection rackets	170
	Glossary	175
	Bibliography	179
	Index	189

Acknowledgments

Countless people assisted me in Indonesia, to all of whom I am extremely grateful. This includes Ririn Stefsani, Adnan Balfas, Samiaji Bintang, Nezar Patria, Zita Ardiantina and many others who prefer to remain anonymous. My friend and driver, Bang Jenggot, has been a regular companion during my times in Jakarta, and his encyclopaedic knowledge of the city's streets and people made the often onerous experience of negotiating Jakarta's traffic a fascinating one.

In most cases I was warmly received by my informants, some of whom feature prominently in this book. Many, I imagine, will not like what I have written here, but I give my sincere thanks to all of them, in particular Aa and the Pasar Minggu crew, Abraham Lunggana, Bang Hercules, Habib Rizieq, KK, Pak Rahman and various FBR gardu spread throughout the city. The former chairman of the Forum Betawi Rempug, the late Kyai Fadloli el-Muhir, was particularly generous with his time and facilitated my access to the organisation without reservation or condition. The current head of the organisation, Kyai Lutfi Hakim, has continued this tradition.

Colleagues at Murdoch University and the Asia Research Centre have been a great source of intellectual stimulation and support. Garry Rodan in particular provided me with an opportunity to get my foot in the door of academia, where I have tried to keep it since, and has given much ongoing encouragement for this project. I also am grateful to all the individuals who have given me feedback over the years, although they may not necessarily be aware of it. This includes Max Lane, Edward Aspinall, Vedi Hadiz, Richard Robison, David Brown, Luky Djani, Lee Wilson, Sidney Jones, Sophie Lemiere and Fabio Scarpello.

Love and gratitude to my wonderful kids Jalada, Sufee and Tiara, for tolerating my frequent periods away, weird sleep patterns and occasional crankiness. Also thanks to my good friends Ben, Neal and Mike Marjinal for periodically extracting me, sometimes with force, from the cocoon of academia. Many thanks go to my partner Tini for her encouragement, unconditional love and patience. This book could never have been done without you.

My parents Leila and Ron were great supporters of my academic pursuits and fascination with Indonesia. My sister Helen took a keen interest in this book in its early stages, enjoying listening to stories of my encounters with its subjects even as she battled, with great dignity and bravery, the ravages of multiple sclerosis. Sadly they will not get to read it, but this book is dedicated to them.

Preface

Throughout 1999–2001 I was living in Bandung, the provincial capital of West Java, undertaking PhD research examining the organisational history and politics of the Malay martial art of *pencak silat*. The research corresponded with a period of intense political and social change in Indonesia. The seemingly immovable President Suharto had fallen from power less than 12 months earlier after 32 years of authoritarian rule. His replacement, B.J. Habibie, called multi-party general elections for June 1999, the first to be held in the country since 1955. Overnight, dozens of new political parties sprang into existence and long-defunct ones were revived. In my neighbourhood in the east of the city, party branches and supporter groups sprung up, and flags and banners lined the streets. These were soon followed by numerous 'command posts' (*pos komando*, or *posko*) set up on street corners and intersections, the most prevalent in my neighbourhood being those belonging to the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (*Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan* or PDI-P) the party led by Megawati Sukarno Puteri, the daughter of Indonesia's first president. Made from bamboo and plywood and colourfully emblazoned with party logos and banners, the posko doubled as a hang out spot and party recruitment centre for local youths, with many soon joining the party's 'task forces' (*satuan tugas*, or *satgas*), its paramilitary-style security wing. Ostensibly the purpose of the satgas was to garner local support, coordinate campaign efforts as well as keeping a more general 'eye on things'. The space occupied by the posko in the neighbourhood had previously been home to *pos siskamling* (an abbreviation of *sistem keamanan lingkungan*, or 'environment security system') – security posts that were part of a complex system of neighbourhood surveillance established during the 1980s by the previous New Order regime. As a resident, I'd been obliged periodically to do a shift on the *ronda malam* 'night watch' at the siskamling post, which entailed a night of drinking coffee, playing cards, smoking clove cigarettes and chatting whilst ostensibly keeping an eye out for strangers or 'suspicious' behaviour.

I knew many of the men hanging around the posko in my neighbourhood via these ronda malam duties, most of whom were in their early twenties. Many, due to economic circumstances, had only finished primary school and had no steady job. Several had spent stints in jail for assault, theft or gambling. They were a friendly but rough lot, in many respects a product of their environment. To make ends meet some worked as security or parking attendants for a local car dealership and jewellery store, others skimmed 'protection' fees from local street

vendors, or operated a *Pak Ogah* ('Mister Do-bugger-all'), informal traffic wardens risking life and limb in a futile attempt to create order from the chaos of Bandung traffic in return for loose change from passing motorists. Many of my neighbours called them *preman*, a colloquial term derived from the Dutch *vrijman*, literally a 'free man', but in contemporary parlance used to refer to a petty thug, standover man or gangster. Now wearing garish red and black camouflage uniforms, army boots, berets and insignia of rank supplied to them by the party, to the unaccustomed eye they looked exactly like military personnel.

The distinction in Indonesia between 'soldier' and 'thug' has indeed not always been clear cut. Throughout the country's modern history, state authorities have regularly relied upon non-state specialists in violence and local toughs who formed part of a vast subcontracted network of social and political control. As Ryter (1998) has noted, up until the 1980s the word '*preman*' had referred specifically to military officers out of uniform, but over time increasingly took on connotations of criminality, pointing to the perceived convergence of public and private violence, and the ambiguity between legality and illegality that characterised the New Order.

Some of the new satgas told me proudly how they had been given basic military training by former officers who had joined the party. Those with a reputation for being tough and experienced fighters were given a higher 'rank'. Their new sense of identity and authority was evident in their increasingly assertive behaviour. A banner they hung at the entrance to the neighbourhood proclaimed a territorial monopoly seemingly at odds with multi-party democracy: 'you are entering an area *owned* by the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle.' Other neighbourhoods had similar banners from other political parties, ethnic or religious organisations or 'youth groups'. The elections were still over two months away, but the satgas acted as if they'd already been given some kind of mandate to rule. Within the space of a month, they had gone from being a tolerated nuisance, who were even occasionally useful when problems arose in the neighbourhood, to what some considered a virtual law unto themselves. Neighbours were intimidated to vote for their preferred candidate, much as an earlier generation of preman had done on behalf of Suharto's ruling party, Golkar. Local store owners suffered daily requests for donations to party 'fighting funds'. Those who declined found themselves subject to intimidation and in at least one instance that I witnessed, physical assault, the victim of which subsequently paid satgas from another party for protection. On several occasions brawls broke out between rival satgas over the placement of party flags which quickly escalated when their comrades from other areas came to back them up. These fights had little to do with competing visions for Indonesia's future, and more to do with struggles over who should or should not have access to what. Concerned these conflicts would spill over, men in a nearby neighbourhood joined a religious vigilante group to keep the satgas at bay. It appeared from this perspective that the new democracy had less been 'hijacked' as some commentators were already suggesting, than it was being interpreted and played out as a competition for territory, resources and rents amongst preman, the poor and unemployed young men – those who arguably had much to gain from political and economic reform. A scan of the Indonesian

media suggested that similar patterns were playing out in other parts of the country.

For all the genuine enthusiasm towards the new political process in my neighbourhood at that time, and the potential many believed it held for ushering in a new era of popular participation and genuine material improvement for its largely working-class residents, the presence of this new but nonetheless familiar breed of '*preman* in uniform' cast a long and at times unsettling shadow. From the perspective of my former ronda malam buddies, however, this *was* democracy, and it offered them via the satgas opportunities for money, authority and prestige. The image of Suharto's authoritarian New Order state seemed, at this level, to have fractured into a complex menagerie of rival groups competing, often through force, to access territory, constituencies and the material benefits that came with it – the reproduction of well-entrenched practices of coercive governance within a multi-party democratic framework.

Now 16 years on, Indonesia has an institutionalised electoral democracy conducted on an impressively vast scale, with direct elections for every position from the president down to village chiefs. The introduction of decentralised forms of electoral-based democratic politics and bureaucratic and administrative reform was, on paper, intended to increase public participation, accountability, transparency and efficiency in the political process, and reduce the conditions giving rise to groups pursuing interests through violence and coercion. In some localities it has had a marked impact in this regard, but in others it has resulted in the proliferation and diversification of such groups. In the case of Jakarta, democratic process has seen violent entrepreneurs, gangs, and militias adjust to and be shaped by the changed socio-political conditions. With a new emphasis upon local as opposed to national politics, those with coercive authority at this level have become at times pivotal players as powerbrokers and mobilisers for a variety of social and political forces, and as contestants for power via the ballot box themselves. It has also seen gangs and street organisations developing into something resembling a kind of representational politics for actors and interests previously excluded from formal politics, in particular the urban poor. As Sassen has noted, 'street level politics makes possible the formation of new types of political subjects that do not have to go through the formal political system' (Sassen 2003, 13).

A ubiquitous part of the urban environment in Jakarta, it is the world of preman, the organisations and gangs that they form and the kinds of politics they engage with and represent, that are the subject of this book. The politics of preman also draw attention to broader issues regarding the local dynamics and practices of state power in Indonesia's post-authoritarian democratic context, and the ways in which different types of formal and informal political authority is established, exercised and contested at the quotidian level.

Structure of the book

Chapter 1 introduces the historical background and theoretical themes central to the study. It examines the types of relationships that have existed among states, gangs and violent entrepreneurs, and considers what this can tell us about the nature of the state itself. It constructs a general theoretical framework for understanding the relationship between types of state power, gangsters and violent entrepreneurs which engages with the work of Tilly, Migdal, Schulte-Bockholt and Horkheimer. It shows that the concept of the protection racket, and its extension in the protection racket regime, provides a useful analytical frame for interpreting the dynamics of state and non-state forms of coercion, violence and power in New Order and post-New Order Indonesia.

Taking the protection racket and the notions of a 'society of rackets' as a conceptual framework, Chapter 2 more clearly outlines the Jakarta case and presents the book's main arguments. It is contended that there are three central themes crucial for understanding the dynamics of the relationship between preman, state and society in post-New Order Jakarta: the reconfiguring of preman to new forms of social and political power; processes of urbanisation, exclusion and the search for security and representation; and the manufacturing of new forms of legitimacy for rackets and protection. In the context of these understandings of social and political change, it is argued that we can identify a number of legitimations of protection regimes in terms of: vigilantism and state failure as an alternative form of social structuration and social welfare in lieu of the state; as new forms of identity politics in localised struggles over territory and resources; and as a product and cause of the emergent market in security, protection and coercive force.

Chapter 3 sketches the complex territorial system of sub-contracted violence established by the New Order, one that linked street-level gangs, thugs and strongmen to the military, bureaucracy and political and economic elites. It charts the historical development of the relationship between gangs, the military and Suharto's authoritarian regime via case studies of a number of New Order-period gangs and martial arts groups illustrating how sub-contracted violence was an inseparable element of the maintenance of state power. It is argued that there was a blurring between state and criminality and private and public violence, leading to a situation where a multitude of actors employed violence and coercion under the guise of the state and its symbols. The relationship that developed between

gangsters and elements of the state apparatus has been characterised as one of *beking* or 'backing', whereby individual or institutional elements of the state apparatus offered protection or leeway to gangs on the condition that a proportion of their profits made its way through the state system, and that they were amenable to performing 'regime maintenance chores' such as the harassment of independent activists or the suppression of progressive social forces. Even if violence was state sanctioned, it was frequently managed in such a way as to give the impression that it was outside immediate state control. In this respect it is argued that the New Order state operated in a manner not far removed from that of the protection racket, analogous to the behaviour of the very gangs that it regularly employed.

In Chapter 4 the transformation of patronage patterns through the period of transition from the New Order to the post-New Order is examined via an analysis of gang turf politics in the district of Tanah Abang in central Jakarta. In contrast to their predecessors who pledged loyalty to nation, state and Golkar, the new guard of Tanah Abang preman was characterised by distinctly 'local' parochial identities most commonly expressed in terms of ethnicity, which intersected with fluxing territorial divisions of turf. If 'national security' had been the rubric for the integration and elimination of preman by the military during the New Order, this chapter argues that in the immediate post-Suharto period in Jakarta 'public order' and 'community' emerged as a discursive realm through which the significantly weakened administration attempted, with only partial success, to reintegrate and co-opt the local authority and coercive capital of preman and strongmen as sub-contracted agents of social control.

The shift towards ethnicity, localism, vigilantism and adaptations of the ideal of the *jago* 'social bandit' as the new basis for legitimising protection regimes, grabs for turf and control over informal markets in Jakarta is explored in Chapter 5 through an analysis of the background to the rise of groups claiming to represent the Betawi, an ethnic group commonly considered the 'indigenous' population of Jakarta. Emerging as part of a broader national revival of ethnicity and localism that accompanied decentralisation and regional autonomy reforms, groups such as the Betawi Brotherhood Forum (*Forum Betawi Rempug*, or FBR), merged critiques of the state and its failure to bring economic prosperity and security to the city's marginal populations with an aggressive rhetoric of rights, constructing themselves as legitimate defenders of an indigenous homeland with exclusivist rights to 'protect', police and tax. In the space of a few years the FBR grew to be the largest 'preman' organisation in Jakarta, defending preman as a social and economic underclass. Over time, its ability to provide 'protection' (in an extractive, defensive and 'moral' sense), extend and expand its territorial and political networks city wide, and offer rudimentary forms of social welfare for its members, has seen the FBR and groups like it grow in size and influence, sidelining other gangs and organised rackets in the city.

Chapter 6 further examines the internal dynamics, practices and structure of the FBR 'on the ground', as well as considering the experiences and motivation for involvement of its membership. It considers some of the tensions and contradictions that have surfaced as the FBR has expanded its presence throughout the

city, come into conflict with rivals, and sought to negotiate and consolidate relationships with various interest groups, such as business, the police and elements of Jakarta's political elites, while still continuing to represent itself to *kampung* residents as a 'vehicle for the powerless'. The types of protection regimes it and others have attempted to establish, the means by which they have sought to do so, and the relations between various rackets and other social and market forces will also be touched upon, together with the Jakarta administration's ongoing attempts at managing and co-opting these groups towards the task of governing the city. Through this, a more general picture emerges of the political economy of rackets in Jakarta's streets and kampung as it developed through the mid-to-late 2000s.

Chapter 7 addresses the question of how this territorial and coercive power and authority, as an actual set of practices, organisational and transactional strategies, has translated into or been used as political capital in the context of multi-party legislative elections, and direct elections for governors and the presidency in Jakarta. The end of the New Order has seen a liberalisation of the political system, and also of its former henchmen and enforcers with political party paramilitary groups, ethnic and religious militias, vigilantes and a range of violent entrepreneurs competing for patronage, constituencies, territory and rackets. Through an examination of the political engagement of the FBR, the Defenders of Islam Front (*Front Pembela Islam*, or FPI) and a coalition of gangs and strongmen supporting the 2014 presidential bid of former Lieutenant General Prabowo Subianto, it will be argued that while political violence and coercion has faded as an effective strategy in contesting elections, the role of gangs and militias has far from diminished. They have become skilled mediators between social groups and between society and the world of formal politics, using this to broker deals, concessions and funds from political parties and aspirants for power. Deeply intertwined with the complex transactional politics that has characterised Indonesia's post-authoritarian electoral democracy, they are both a challenge to democracy and its most accomplished practitioners. The conclusion ends with some general observations regarding the politics of protection rackets and its possible future directions.

Methodology

The book combines historical narrative, political sociology and ethnography. Periods of fieldwork were conducted in Jakarta from 2006 to 2014, often in short blocks of several weeks in order to fit with teaching and work obligations. During this time numerous interviews were conducted as well as many hours spent 'hanging out' (*nongkrong*) with members of gangs, militias, mass organisations and vigilante groups, members of the neighbourhoods and communities in which they were based, local government officials, police and politicians. Alongside relevant academic work, the Indonesian print and electronic media was an enormous and invaluable source of information critical to this study, as were a number of Indonesian journalists who helped to introduce me to informants.

The choice of Jakarta as the main focus of this book is both a deliberate and an expedient one. Due to the pervasive image of centralised state power during the New Order, and as the nation's capital, events in Jakarta have tended to be equated with 'national' politics to the extent that its distinctly local character is often overlooked and not examined in its own right. Decentralisation has gone some way in altering this dynamic, prompting what is now a massive field of studies in local and regional politics 'away from the centre'. This, however, has for the most part yet to extend to Jakarta itself, which has also undergone a substantial process of social and political change as an outcome of decentralisation reforms, including direct elections for key political positions. The choice of case studies was based upon a number of factors, some analytical, others circumstantial, including issues of accessibility to a world that while ubiquitous, is often characterised by secrecy, hostility and suspicion, together with the authors' judgement regarding the reliability of available sources.

Focusing attention upon a particular aspect of complex and dynamic societies does by necessity involve privileging it above others, and at times exaggerating its significance. Consequently, it is worth stating at the outset that this book does not present a comprehensive history or analysis of the periods and places upon which it dwells. As observers of Indonesia and social and political life more generally will be aware, any event opens up an endless array of lines of investigation, and the hardest decisions are often those regarding what *not* to include. While some of the conclusions reached in this study can be generalised and, I hope, have broader analytical value, these remain of course most applicable to the specific setting of the research.

1 Protection, violence and the state

> Over and over again, effective nongovernmental specialists in violence have made alliances with governments, become parts of governments, taken over existing governments, or become governments of their own.
>
> (Tilly 1985, 38)

In Indonesia the nongovernmental 'specialists in violence' described by Tilly have been a ubiquitous and conspicuous figure throughout both recent and more distant history, albeit in a variety of regional variations and manifestations: vigilantes, militias, gangs, racketeers, hit men, petty criminals, political thugs, private security and mercenaries.[1] The qualities of each of these types vary and have transformed over time, as has their relationship to state and society, but nonetheless they have remained persistent and often central actors in both the maintenance and transformation of power and different forms of political authority. Drawing on case studies from the nation's capital, Jakarta, this book takes as its specific focus *preman*, a colloquial term for a thug or gangster, and other 'entrepreneurs in violence' in post-New Order Indonesia, charting shifts in patterns of practice, organisation and relations with informal and formal political power and authority.[2]

The fact that these individuals and organisations have survived and flourished despite the ending of 32 years of authoritarian rule under Suharto and the introduction of democratic reforms raises important questions: how has democratic reform and decentralisation influenced the nature of preman gangs, organisations and the kinds of politics, power and authority they represent? What are the implications of predatory coalitions between gangsters and political elites for political regime directions? To what extent have these groups been associated with the consolidation of specific social interests? What are the social, political and economic repercussions of the trading of violence and protection as a political and market resource? Is this a marked departure from the forms of political gangsterism of the Suharto era and what does it imply for the types of social and political orders that have emerged? This book will consider these questions through its examination of the changing nature of preman groups, mass organisations and violent entrepreneurs in Jakarta in the context of larger changes in the political and social life of post-New Order Indonesia.

In contrast to the New Order regime, a nominal consent-based legitimacy has been conferred upon the post-Suharto state through the implementation of multi-party electoral democracy and direct election of the president and national and local legislatures, decentralisation reforms, and a reduced role of the military in the nation's political and economic life. Challenges to this have been many. These include endemic political corruption, the persistence of entrenched oligarchies, the fragmentation of pro-reform forces and relative absence of mass popular representation, and patchy and erratic progress in addressing key problems such as poverty, unemployment and the provision of basic services such as education and health for the majority of the population. The presence of groups using coercive strategies in the pursuit of particularistic interests has both added to and been a product of these challenges. There has been a shift in the political economy of coercion away from what could broadly be referred to as state-related violence, although it is often difficult to see where the state begins and ends, with an increase in violence and coercion as a central strategy used by a variety of different social, economic and political interests. A politically fragmented landscape is filled with a multiplicity of social and political forces employing and laying claim to legitimacy in the use of coercion. This book considers some of the reasons behind this and contends that there are historical legacies of previous configurations of formal and informal power established during the New Order. Most important, they represent the opportunities presented by the particular way in which decentralised democracy has been implemented, experienced and practised in Indonesia's post-authoritarian society.

Indonesia fits a well-documented pattern in which gangs and gangsters often emerge as major beneficiaries of democratic electoral politics as candidates, revenue raisers and powerbrokers able to mobilise support, intimidate rivals and perform other services on behalf of clients (Trocki 1998). As Masaaki and Rozaki have pointed out, non-state violence in Indonesia continues to occur not because the state necessarily condones it, but due to the fact that political and economic elites rely upon it to consolidate their own power and interests (Masaaki and Rozaki 2006, xi).

Violence, power and legitimacy

Any discussion of nongovernmental specialists in violence is predicated upon the existence and maintenance of a particular set of relationships and conceptual boundaries determining 'state' and 'society'. In order to understand the contours of this relationship in contemporary Indonesia we must first consider some of the broader theoretical issues that emerge from an examination of the relationship between informal violence and different configurations of state and elite power. My intention here is not to give a comprehensive overview or analysis of the diverse range of theories or a nuanced critique of them, which would be beyond the scope of this book and the capacities of the author. Rather, the intention is to develop a general

framework to think with, or against, in relation to the empirical cases, engaging theoretical frameworks provided by Weber, Tilly, Migdal and Schulte-Bockholt. In particular I will argue that the concept of the protection racket and its extension in the protection racket regime are useful for understanding the dynamics of informal violence and coercive authority in New Order and post-New Order Indonesia.

The theoretical tradition derived from the work of Max Weber which has until relatively recently dominated Western scholarship on the modern state has identified a 'territorial monopoly over the legitimate use of physical force' as its defining characteristic (Weber 1964, 154). Taken at face value, the Weberian notion logically entails that a state would endeavour to eliminate or pacify any internal or external rivals to its monopoly, its legitimacy contingent upon successful control over both the means and use of violence within its territory. However, in many states, including twentieth-century Indonesia, the state and its agencies have not only failed to monopolise fully the use and means of force, but have sponsored both covertly and overtly and otherwise actively encouraged various forms of subcontracted non-state violence, including in ways that appear to act against its interests. Alongside this it has faced an array of internal challengers in the form of separatist movements, insurgencies, terrorism and organised crime. What does this tell us about the nature of the state and the state-society dynamic in relation to the use of violence? How useful is the Weberian definition as a conceptual tool for understanding nature of violent entrepreneurs and their position and role in contemporary Indonesia? In order to make some ground in answering these questions it is necessary to deconstruct further the logic of Weber's definition of state.

According to Weber it is 'legitimacy' that sets the state apart in its use of violence from other violence-wielding groups and individuals. What is it that makes state violence legitimate, and legitimate to whom? Weber considered the state as the product of struggles for domination in which legitimacy emerged as the product of the capacity of one group first to limit violence from competing groups through the development of a superior coercive force, the maintenance of territorial boundaries, followed by the transformation of the coercive apparatus into bureaucratic and legal institutions for the enforcement of laws and rights (Weber 1978, 78). Other ideal-type 'legitimations' for domination highlighted by Weber include 'tradition', 'mores sanctified through the unimaginably ancient recognition and habitual orientation to conform', and charisma, the devotion and obedience to a leader based upon belief in the values, virtues and powers ascribed to them (Weber 1978, 904). In this respect, the 'criminal', 'subversive' or 'illegitimate' is defined as such only in reference to the rules, laws and whims of a prevailing authority, the 'winner' of Weber's struggle for domination. In practice the ability to define and enforce notions of 'justice' often has little to do with codified law. Frequently violence has been judged by various states based more upon its relative effectiveness than by adherence to established rules or abstract

principles of justice. As Spinoza identified, the paradox of the state has been that while it establishes the law, there is nothing that makes it inherently bound to it (Spinoza 1951). Racketeer or security guard, gangster or entrepreneur, subversive or patriot are all labels applied by the dominant power and dependent upon the nature of the relationship of a group or individuals to this dominant power.

Perhaps then it is not surprising that viewed in an historical and comparative perspective the oscillating line between 'legitimate' state violence and 'illegitimate' non-state violence has been one fraught with conceptual ambiguities.[3] This is especially so in the context of Southeast Asian states where power was consolidated primarily via domination and ideological hegemony rather than any notion of consent of the governed or a Hobbesian-style social contract. As the history of the regions testifies, internal pacification of populations was also at best partial. Volkov points out in his study of post-Soviet Russia, that organised crime and by extension 'illegitimate' non-state violence can only be identified when the state and the particular system of order it enforces are functional and in place. In the absence of this there is 'little more than a number of competing protection agencies with weak legitimacy' (Volkov 2002, 22). While it may be true that legitimacy is ultimately 'in the eye of the beholder', a matter of normative judgement, this fails to explain the ways in which it can be 'manufactured' as the product of a relationship of exchange involving coercive force, and the outcome of particular structural arrangements between violence-wielding groups.

Taylor has argued that in practice states never fully possess an actual monopoly over force even if they may claim it. According to Taylor, what a nominally functional state does constitute is 'a concentration of force and the attempt by those in whose hands it is (incompletely) concentrated to determine who else shall be permitted to employ force and on what occasions' (Taylor 1982, 5). Tilly also avoids any mention of legitimacy or monopolisation in the use of force in his definition of the state, identifying it simply as an entity 'controlling the principle means of coercion within a given territory' (Tilly 1975, 62). What both authors suggest is that once the principal means of force has been brought under effective control, which in the case of most nation-states involves the military and police, other violence-wielding groups can potentially be managed or contained through a combination of negotiation, subcontracting, incorporation, suppression or elimination.[4] In this context 'legitimacy' emerges as a product of the outcome of struggles for domination in which the state emerges as the agent that exercises violence, or the management of it, more effectively than rival groups in the achievement of a particular form of social and political 'order'.

In his analysis of Weber's definition, Migdal argues that it is necessary to separate the Weberian model into two distinct realms.[5] Migdal contends that the ideal-type state as a unified and legitimate monopoliser of force exists at the ideological level (or as an 'image'), and hence is of little analytical value when attempting to understand the interaction between state and society at

the 'mundane' level of quotidian social space (Migdal 2001, 16). In other words, states commonly portray themselves as possessing a legitimate monopoly, projecting supremacy and uniformity, but more commonly the social reality is that this monopoly is partial and the aggregation of a multitude of ongoing contests and struggles at the local level. Thus Migdal proposes a less rigid definition of the state as a 'field of power marked by the use and threat of violence' (Migdal 2001, 15). This field is shaped by the 'image of a coherent, controlling organization', Weber's legitimate monopoliser, along with the 'actual practices of its multiple parts' which can both reinforce and undermine this image (Migdal 2001, 16). Such a definition allows us to sidestep comparisons with the ideal-type state, and the attendant questions of why or why not a monopoly is in place, in effect reproducing the state's own ideology, and instead focus attention upon the largely empirical question of identifying the dynamics and contradictions of the practices and strategies of the parts making up this 'field of power' (Migdal 2001, 16).[6] If the state represents the organising principle of a particular social order, informal violence and coercion can also be used in the formal sphere both to enforce the social order and to resist it.

The political economy of protection

If we employ Migdal's conceptualisation of the state as a field of power in which coercive force and violence are exercised, what are the intended outcomes of this violence? Violence of course has many causes and motivations, but as a strategy foundational to forms of political power it is generally considered a 'resource', not an end in itself. The economic historian Frederic Lane has described governments as violence-controlling enterprises that produce and sell the commodity of 'protection' (Lane 1979, 22). Drawing from Lane's work, Tilly has extended this point, suggesting that states should be understood primarily as providers of protection, a characteristic they share with gangs, racketeers and organised crime. For both, violence's 'function' is the production of the commodity of protection which is, due to the very means by which it is produced, a 'double-edged sword':

> The word protection sounds two contrasting tones. One is comforting, the other ominous. With one tone 'protection' calls up images of the shelter against danger provided by a powerful friend, a large insurance company, or a sturdy roof. With the other, its evokes the racket in which a local strong man forces merchants to pay tribute in order to avoid damage – damage the strong man himself threatens to deliver. The difference, to be sure, is a matter of degree…Which image of the word *protection* brings to mind depends mainly upon our assessment of the reality and externality of the threat.
>
> (Tilly 1985, 170)

Tilly contends that a functional state can emerge over time when an arrangement is met in which protection is provided by the state to its constituents in return for access to resources, usually obtained via taxation and rent extraction. As Volkov has identified, taken in isolation the relationship between a protector and a citizen/client/victim appears like straight out extortion or domination when there is an absence of consent or if there is no offer of real or imaginary service in return for tribute (Volkov 2002, 35). As a long-term political and economic arrangement, however, this is unsustainable. It is only in the context of the existence of an array of internal or external actors using or threatening violence that protection can appear real or even legitimate: 'the concept of protection implies a multiplicity of interacting wielders of force, each of whom can simultaneously act as a threat and as protection' (Volkov 2002, 35). Therefore the function of protection can only emerge from an apparent absence of a monopoly of force, when there is an identifiable 'other' to protect against. What this suggests is that if no identifiable threat exists, one needs to be created.

A protection racket can be defined as a relationship in which coercive force and intimidation is used in order to secure money, resources or power on the pretext of offering protection from an external threat. Implicit in the relationship is the threat of violence. In other words the source and solution to the threat are one and the same, the racketeer appearing as both protector and exploiter. Applying this to the state, insofar as the threats against which the state claims to protect in return for tribute are imaginary, or the product of the state's own practices, it is operating a racket. As Tilly states:

> Someone who produces both the danger and, at a price, the shield against it, is a racketeer. Someone who provides a needed shield but has little control over the danger's appearance qualifies as a legitimate protector, especially if the price is no higher than his competitors.
>
> (Tilly 1985, 173)

Drawing out the analogy, Tilly contends that war making along with state making are 'the quintessential protection rackets with the advantage of legitimacy' (Tilly 1985, 169). Tilly's model cites four main activities for would-be state makers. The first is war making, the elimination of rivals outside the territory over which a territorial monopoly is claimed. The second is state making, whereby internal rivals are either eliminated or pacified. The third is the protection of state clients via the elimination of their rivals, while the fourth involves monopolisation over the control of resource extraction in order to acquire the means to carry out the other three activities (Tilly 1985, 181). Here it is worth recounting Day's observation that in the case of modern Indonesia, the principal means of coercion, the military, has conducted almost all of its fighting against fellow Indonesians identified for varying reasons as 'others'. This reached its most horrific peak, but by no means end, in the massacres of 1965–66 (Day 2002, 234). Whereas in fifteenth- to

sixteenth-century Europe, from which Tilly draws his examples, state formation was strengthened primarily by waging wars with neighbouring nation-states which resulted in the consolidation of territorial borders marking monopolisations of force, in modern Indonesia state power expanded and legitimated itself almost entirely via the identification and violent subjugation of internal enemies. In this respect the protective function of the state was, as Volkov has indicated, predicated upon the continued presence of an array of threats to security within the boundaries of the nation-state. Only then could authoritarian and military rule give the impression of being the imposition of a necessary and reciprocal relationship of exchange rather than a simple 'demanding of ransom' (Volkov 2002, 35).

Stanley has described a similar situation in Latin America, where states used protection against internal enemies as a rationale to 'increase their call on the resources of capital and strengthen the claims of militaries, rather than civilians, to control the state' (Stanley 1996, 36). In this way violence and coercion in its guise as 'protection' became a primary currency of relations between the state and society. These Weberian-based views see that state as predatory, operating above society and driven by discrete interests. It uses its power to produce and preserve self-serving arrangements, protecting them, often with violence, against internal threats. This also allows the state, conceptualised as a coherent unity, to charge its clients for the protection it claims to provide. If the state represents the organising principle of a particular social order and embodies social power, informal violence and violent entrepreneurs can also be used either to enforce the state's social order, or to resist it, influencing the way gangs are incorporated or excluded.

The state, gangs and racket regimes

If states operate in a manner akin to protection rackets, how do we then understand other, more localised, rackets such as those operated by criminal gangs and organised crime? Does the state consider these to be part of the threat against which it offers protection or could they become an auxiliary or franchise of state power? Drawing from O'Donnell's categorisation of the varying degrees of state presence in a given territory, Rodgers (2004, 7) argues that state authority can coexist territorially with localised non-state forms of 'order' such as gangs, militias and organised crime. Rodgers contends that, 'like the Weberian state at the national level, gangs possess a monopoly over the predominant forms of violence at the neighbourhood level' (Rodgers 2004, 7). If from this perspective, states and non-state specialists in violence such as gangs deal in essentially the same commodity, differing only in matters of scale and efficiency, then the relationship between them can take on a number of distinct forms that range from antagonism and conflict to co-option and mutual cooperation. Rodgers contends that the existence of different forms of 'order' and social sovereignty such as that represented by

gangs within the territorial boundaries of the nation-state is not necessarily indicative of a weak state, but rather an institutional transformation or 'mutation' of the state's modes and logics of operation (Rodgers 2004, 9).

In circumstances where the institutional arms of the state possesses a partial degree of effective presence, the localised territorial nature of gangs can make them a natural 'ally' for bolstering state power and maintain amenable forms of 'order' at the local level, operating as franchises of state power. Through appropriating the territorial power of the gang, it also allows the state access to informal economies, the preserve of gangs and mafias, which are by definition economic transactions from where the state 'neither provides protection nor receives a cut' (Centeno and Portes 2006, 26). Recognising the reality of this territorial coexistence, according to Rodgers, 'allows us to think about the relationship between violence, order and the state in a less epistemologically constrained manner, along a continuum where the boundaries between state and non-state forms of authority can become blurred' (Rodgers 2006, 316). If combined with Tilly's approach to understanding the relationship between protection and power, informal groups can be understood as operating as mini-racket states circulating the big state, the state as a kind of social relation, as Jessop has argued, but on different economies of scale (Jessop 2012). Violence and coercion are not always from the top down but can be dispersed and produced at multiple sites (Kelly and Shah 2006). These arrangements flourish in corners where the state does not reach or where it has become a virtual subcontractor, what Batalas (2003, 150) has called 'inverse racketeering', whereby the state becomes a client rather than a supplier of protection. Through such a relationship, the state is freed from the Weberian ideal of having to exercise coercion uniformly over its territory, using it in a more targeted and instrumental way (Kelly and Shah 2006, 255). As a conceptual tool this notion of territorial coexistence can aid in understanding the dynamics of the 'blurriness' between formal and informal violence, and how and under what circumstances local gangs, rackets and other non-government specialists in violence can share common interests with the state in the maintenance of particular types of social, economic and political order.

The criminologist Alfredo Schulte-Bockholt has sought to conceptualise the links between regimes and organised crime, arguing that organised crime groups, which are often considered apolitical in nature, 'become ideological by adapting to the world view prevalent in the elite structures into which they integrate' (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 22). According to this theory, a 'strong state', be it a democracy or dictatorship, will generally endeavour to eliminate or co-opt alternative sources of protection. However, during a 'crisis of hegemony' when elites believe their interests to be under threat, such as during a period of rapid socio-political upheaval, they will often seek to form alliances with organised crime, gangs, etc. in order to suppress counter-hegemonic forces (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 26). In these circumstances the interests of predatory states and violent entrepreneurs dovetail. Elites require the

localised coercive power of organised crime, while for the groups themselves, alignment with elite interests can further integration within the central structures of domination.

This results in what Schulte-Bockholt refers to as 'protection racket regimes', which are 'formed by state and/or non-state elites in order to preserve their domination through the violent exclusion of large groups in society that experience conditions of substantial social disparities' (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 35). In these racket regimes coercion replaces hegemony as the primary means to maintain political and social control, and is used to extract wealth from society irrespective of the opposition it creates (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 27). In order to remain in power, elites incorporate potentially disruptive sub-hegemonic groups such as gangs within its networks of economic advantage. In doing so, the dominant class is expanded across conventional class lines, becoming a 'structure of rackets rooted in a specific mode of production' (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 27). The degree to which organised crime and gangs are integrated into elite structures varies, and is determined by the needs of elites, who will use the power of the state when the services of organised crime are considered a threat or are simply no longer needed (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 36). Gangs and organised crime such as the mafia are rarely allowed to share political power as equal partners. There are exceptions, however, such as post-Soviet Russia where organised crime successfully integrated itself within state institutions to the extent that it became almost impossible to disentangle 'criminal' and 'state' interests (Volkov 2002).

While Tilly argues that states show characteristics of predatory organised crime, Schulte-Bockholt uses this model to reverse the argument, suggesting that in practice, organised crime groups and violent entrepreneurs commonly resemble repressive regimes (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 32–34). The concern with the monopolisation of resource extraction, the use of violent coercive force, secretive hierarchical modes of organisation and hostility towards unions and organised labour are all elements of organised crime shared with the politics of the right. In a comparative perspective it is perhaps then unsurprising that organised crime has with few exceptions aligned itself with repressive governments. In post-World War II Sicily for example, the role of the Mafia has been described by Hess as 'a reactionary force…employed to resist change, to maintain privilege and to suppress attempts to redefine property relations and rights' (Hess 1986, 128). Similarly, in Japan the Yakuza has been linked with ultra-nationalists within the military, and in the United States during the 1920s and 1930s gangsters such as the infamous Capone family worked together with the authorities to harass labour activists (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 34). Latin America is also replete with examples of drug lords joining forces with military dictatorships to fight left-wing rebels and suppress pro-democracy movements.[7] The globalisation of markets and the decline in state power have done little to alter this tendency, the resulting growth of transnational organised crime described by Shelley as 'a new form of non-state based authoritarianism' (Shelley 1999, 25).

Seen from both the macro perspective of state-based power and the more localised power of gangs and organised crime, the racket is a model for socioeconomic oppression. Despite the historical alignment of organised racketeering with repressive regimes, Schulte-Bockholt contends that protection rackets are not characteristic of a particular type of political organisation or historical periods, and can just as easily be a part of formal democracies (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 35). As this book will show, racketeers and predatory interests have adapted to the introduction of institutional democracy in Indonesia, taking advantage of freedoms to organise, to carve out new niches and align themselves with a range of reactionary and predatory social forces. Ironically, the only type of political system that has successfully 'eliminated' organised crime and racketeering has been totalitarian regimes such as Mussolini's Italy and Nazi Germany, which did so by appropriating its function (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 24). Schulte-Bockholt differs from Tilly, who saw racket states as the product of a particular historical period and stage of state-formation. Drawing from the work on rackets by the Frankfurt School scholar Max Horkheimer, Schulte-Bockholt contends that the protection racket can be extracted as an historical principle, what Horkheimer called 'an archetype of domination', one that would manifest regardless of time and place but in accord with the particularistic conditions of a specific time and place (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 26).

Taken in this light, the protection racket is not just a manifestation of 'criminality' resulting from gaps in law enforcement or the monopolisation of resources by elites through violence, but a far more fundamental concept for understanding the dynamics of power relationships between various social actors and groups. The institution of the protection racket, as both a structural arrangement between wielders of force and a relationship of exchange between state and society is useful in shedding light on how authoritarian and predatory regimes and interests manufacture legitimacy through coercive strategies in lieu of obtaining it via consensual means. Consent to govern or 'protect' can be given as much due to reasons of fear of the protector, the threat they claim to protect against, or both. As an organisational strategy the racket can also illuminate the operational logics of the complex networks of clientelism, patronage and franchising of the protective function of the New Order, which harnessed the localised territorial monopolies of gangs and violent entrepreneurs to expand state power and gain access to revenue from the informal economy.

The Indonesian case: a brief genealogy of rackets

How relevant is the concept of the protection racket and racket regime when applied to the case of Indonesia? What form have gang-state relations taken, and to what extent have they been determined by the composition of the state itself? Can we identify the sets of social and political conditions that have led to the establishment of alliances between state and non-state actors employing

violence? In order to begin answering these questions and to set the context for our examination of the New Order and post-New Order it is important to examine some of the historical trajectories that have developed. As Bertrand (2004b, 326) has noted, since independence in 1945 the process of state formation in Indonesia has been highly dependent upon various forms of indirect government and informal authority, a fact that has been central to the facilitation of alliances between arms of the state and criminal elements. Similarly, Trocki (1998, 11–12) underscores the importance of understanding the pre-democratic political history of Southeast Asian countries where gangsters have become a characteristic of modern democratic life, especially the legacies of colonialism. In Indonesia, such a requirement also applies. As we shall see, the relationship between state and criminal networks extends back to pre-independence, finding its heritage in the nature of colonial power and centre-periphery relations established during the colonial state. Later, predatory and criminal elements featured prominently in the independence struggle, being well positioned to find a place in the contested politics of the new republic. In the brief history that follows, we shall seek to identify and highlight some of these patterns of relationships and connections between violent entrepreneurs and political power, and particular conditions in which they arose, to paraphrase Schulte Nordholt (2002), a 'genealogy of rackets'.

Colonial regimes

Prior to the arrival of the Dutch, the social landscape was peppered with an assortment of bandits, warriors, mercenaries, mystics, warlords, princes and a host of strongmen and violence-wielding groups who lived in what Schulte Nordholt has described as a 'hostile co-existence' (Schulte Nordholt 1991). The political reality has been characterised by historians as a 'contest state' – one in which the establishment of any kind of effective control over local populations and natural resources involved constant negotiation, alliance making and breaking, alongside ritualised and ruthlessly pragmatic displays of violence (Schulte Nordholt 1991, 75). Schulte Nordholt has further argued that this situation facilitated the growth of a multitude of hybrid forms of subcontracted public and private violence, of which local strongmen known as *jago* (literally, 'fighting cock') were one of the most salient (Schulte Nordholt 1991).

A jago was said to possess physical prowess in the form of skills in martial arts (usually pencak silat), and was believed to have access to a swag of magical and supernatural abilities, such as invulnerability and invisibility which they achieved through tutelage under a *guru* or extended periods of ascetic retreat and deprivation. Akin to a personality cult, jago bands came and went in accord with the fortunes of their leader. Their social capital came in their embodiment of cultural ideals regarding physical and spiritual potency and intimate knowledge of local conditions, whilst their political capital was found in their proficiency in the use of violent force and ability to

mediate between peasant society and higher authorities. While it was common practice for jago to raid and plunder neighbouring villages, they were often fiercely protective of their own community and for this reason commanded loyalty, albeit underpinned by fear of the consequences if this loyalty were betrayed. The inevitable conclusion reached by the population was that 'power and crime and were synonymous' (Schulte Nordholt 2002, 40).

The initial arrival and gradual expansion of Dutch colonial rule did not disturb the jago. It was only in the nineteenth century, with the advent of a bureaucratically organised government, that their role shifted (Schulte Nordholt 1991, 77). Rather than being the object of repression, jago became 'an integral part of the colonial power structure', resulting from a 'stagnating process of state-formation' (Schulte Nordholt and Till 1999, 51). The colonial administration was based in Batavia, but had little effective reach into the rural heartland of Java. In order to consolidate its rule, the Dutch established a parallel indirect government headed by indigenous officials known as *bupati* (regents) and *pangreh praja* ('rulers of the realm', administrative corps) to govern Java (Sutherland 1979). At the village level, anything resembling a monopoly over force was the preserve of the jago, hence any effort to establish 'order' by necessity had to involve their incorporation. Without an adequate police force to support them and with shallow roots in the area in which they were assigned, the pangreh praja effectively became clients of the jago to gain some degree of control over the countryside. As long as the appearance of 'order' was maintained, jago could continue unhindered with their banditry, theft and extortion.

The situation in Batavia was different, but here also jago emerged as powerful figures constituting what Cribb has described as 'a network standing outside of the hierarchy of government authority, antagonistic to it yet not overtly hostile' (Cribb 1991, 15). As a society based almost entirely upon trade, in which most Indonesians worked as labourers for the colonial regime, labour bosses and their entourage of overseers and jago enforcers were central to the economic life of the city. As Cribb has stated, the world of labour control blended with the criminal underworld constituting a necessary component of social control (Cribb 1991, 15). It was in this context that the Dutch-derived term *vrijman* ('freeman'), later to become preman, entered common parlance to describe a new breed of urban jago, a freelance entrepreneur in force who 'is not in the service of the Dutch East India Company, but has permission to be in the Indies, and carries out trade for the sake of the VOC' (Ryter 1998, 50).[8] In a society bound by law, the vrijman existed in a legal and conceptual grey zone, operating both inside and outside the law.

By the turn of the century the increasing bureaucratisation of the colonial administration resulted in the gradual marginalisation of the jago, displacing them from their traditional role in village life as well as their political position as intermediaries and power brokers (Schulte Nordholt 1991). Their status increasingly shifted to that of a 'criminal' and 'outlaw'. At the same time that jago were being pushed to the margins other social forces began to emerge

within Indonesian society which recognised their 'revolutionary' potential. For example, during the 1920s the emerging Indonesian Communist Party (*Partai Komunis Indonesia*, or PKI) actively recruited *jawara* (champions, or martial arts experts) into its ranks (Williams 1990). Like political parties of recent times, the PKI saw jawara as a vital intermediary between party officials and the local population, and their influence proved crucial in gaining wide-scale support amongst peasants through both threats of violence and ability in managing labour recruitment. By 1926 the Banten branch of the PKI had established a 'jawara section', a precursor to the *satgas* paramilitaries and ethnic militias of the present (Williams 1990, 196). PKI leaders proclaimed jawara as committed to the people's cause; however, in reality they continued their criminal activities, the party's growing influence helping them gain a stronger foothold in cattle auctions and labour recruitment (Williams 1990, 188).

Revolution and independence, 1945–49

The disarmament and gradual withdrawal of the Japanese in 1945 after three years of harsh rule during which organised gangs were crushed, left a gaping power vacuum. The nationalists Sukarno and Hatta declared Indonesian independence on 17 August 1945; however, they presided over a virtual government. Throughout the country formal power structures established by the Japanese occupying force crumbled and gave way to often violent local struggles for power and resources (Stoler 1988). Lucas has documented how in Pekalongan in north-central Java, *lenggaong*, a local term for jago, meted out their own form of rough justice to local officials, police and Chinese, many instating themselves as village chiefs (Lucas 1991).[9] Some jago groups established what have been described as short-lived 'jago republics', adopting gang names with 'revolutionary' connotations (Smail 1964, 124). This initial lawlessness, while providing opportunities for plunder, was generally disapproved of by many local gang bosses, as it allowed a new swath of rivals to gain a foothold (Cribb 1991, 51). With so much competition, ideological allegiance to the goal of a new republic, like that given to the PKI, provided a pragmatic advantage of 'legitimacy', opened up the opportunity of being accommodated within the embryonic republican government and helped to consolidate the local authority of bosses.

The return of Dutch and allied forces in 1945 began a four-year period of sustained guerrilla warfare, carried out by myriad local self-organised groups operating largely outside control of the embryonic state, united only in their opposition to a re-establishment of Dutch rule. Militias, jago bands and urban gangs formed a significant portion of organised resistance that often overshadowed that of the official republican army (Stoler 1988, 231). The jago band, with its closed and secretive structure, familiarity with violence, belief in invulnerability in the face of superior Dutch firepower and adeptness at evading the authorities, made it a perfect vehicle for guerrilla warfare.

Ryter has questioned Cribb's assumption of an identifiable distinction between revolutionary nationalist youth, criminal gangs and jago, suggesting that it was only after independence and the consolidation of the Indonesian armed forces that they became more differentiated (Ryter 1998, 52). It appears that regardless of what label was applied, robbery, extortion and brutality were standard practice on all sides. Frederick has pointed out that during the period of revolutionary turmoil villagers made no distinction between the republican army, irregular laskar militias and bandit gangs, for the simple fact that all were equally dangerous and predatory, imposing food levies on local populations in return for protection, or simply taking it under threat of violence (Frederick 2002).

Post-independence Jakarta

Post-1949 one of the problems facing the republican government and its project of consolidating state institutions was how best to integrate laskar and jago militias. Some found a place within the new national army, but the majority returned to their respective neighbourhoods. With few skills and scant job opportunities, many made a living from predation and petty crime, for which post-revolution Jakarta provided ample opportunities. Several groups of former laskar and jago established their own broad-based organisations, setting a precedent for jago organisations not linked to a political party. For example, Imam Sjafe'i, a former criminal boss in Senen, Jakarta, who had fought with his laskar against the Dutch, formed 'Special Forces' (*Pasukan Istimewa*, or PI) (Fauzi 2004). Together with its subgroup, *Sebenggol*, which consisted of pickpockets, PI exercised authority over large areas of Jakarta, operating protection rackets alongside a quasi-government for Jakarta's criminal underworld, so-called jago republics (Fauzi 2004, 6). PI jago coordinated the activity of local pickpockets and provided support for the families of criminals who were caught and imprisoned (Fauzi 2004, 13). With the backing of the organisation, many PI affiliated jago were able to secure positions as neighbourhood heads (*Rukun Tetangga*, or RT).[10] In lieu of a functioning official police force, these jago networks also operated as an informal form of security for which they extracted payment from local businesses, especially ethnic Chinese.[11]

In 1951 both PI and *Kobra*, a Jakarta gang made up of former independence fighters and led by Imam Sjafe'i, affiliated with the Indonesian Association for Former Freedom Fighters (*Persatuan Bekas Pejuang Seluruh Indonesia*, or *Perbepsi*), an umbrella organisation for former laskar set up by the military. Army Chief of Staff General Nasution, who during the revolution had been assigned the task of disarming laskar militia and absorbing them under the command of the republican army, saw the potential of former laskar for helping establish the role of the military within the new parliamentary system. Post-independence he continued the job of co-option, and was instrumental in establishing a new pole of cooperation between the

military, former laskar, jago, youth groups and the criminal world that would be further institutionalised after the New Order came to power in 1965 (Cribb 1991, 129).[12]

After being removed as army chief of staff, Nasution continued his political agenda via the Association for the Supporters of Indonesian Independence (*Ikatan Pendukung Kemerdekaan Indonesia*, or IPKI) – a political party whose membership drew upon military, former laskar and jago networks. Pemuda Pancasila was born out of the 'youth wing' of IPKI (Ryter 1998, 52). With the support of its jago-criminal social base, Nasution and IPKI helped create the pressure that culminated in Sukarno dissolving the Constituent Assembly and instigating the period of Guided Democracy (1959–65), which saw non-elected representatives, most notably the military and its allies, appointed to parliament (Ryter 1998, 52).

From this brief and selective survey of Indonesian history we can see that due to their skill in coercion and localised territorial power, violent entrepreneurs such as the jago have been essential allies for the consolidation of political power, while embodying the contradictions that come with their 'informal' status. In times of crisis of hegemony when political and social institutions are in flux, such as during the revolution, violent entrepreneurs have sought to benefit from breakdowns in social order, and aligned themselves ideologically with dominant or emergent social and political forces in order to facilitate integration within them and to consolidate and legitimate rackets. Inversely, colonial and post-colonial elites and aspirants for power have sought to harness the territorial power of violent entrepreneurs, networks of criminal rackets and subcontracted forms of violence in the establishment and maintenance of particular configurations of social order and the suppression of forces that threaten to disrupt them.

The New Order preman

During the New Order the institutionalisation of gangs, many of which were at the forefront of the anti-communist pogroms that brought Suharto to power in 1965, was intensified. They were co-opted by arms of state, most significantly the military, into a broader structural racket akin to informal franchised branches, and allowed to operate their own localised rackets on the condition that proceeds made their way into formal government structures. As Barker states, preman were a 'necessary component in the maintenance of state power and the collection of taxes', suggesting that preman activity generally increased during times of economic prosperity (Barker 1999, 122). Lindsey proposes that in the low-wage economy of the New Order, where access to wealth by the urban poor was so tightly restricted, *premanisme* was for some a rational livelihood strategy for gaining access to this surplus wealth through illegal rents (Lindsey 2001). In this respect the New Order manufactured the conditions that resulted in the reproduction of its own predatory racketeering, albeit on a smaller scale.

For these layers of rackets to function, preman gangs also needed to be amenable to performing 'regime maintenance chores', including the terrorising and intimidation of dissidents and other social forces that held the potential to disrupt established power relationships, and paying lip service to state ideology. To this end, preman groups often took the form of nationalist and youth associations devoted to state-designated goals, or affiliated with state-created ones. These in turn acted as sub-franchises of state power, adopting national-scale organisational structures that mirrored those of government – what Ryter has described as 'a nested system of *jago*s, where local bosses would be formally subordinate to the higher level "manager" of the branch or sub-district but expect to retain significant local autonomy over revenues' (Ryter 1998, 66). While the state could not completely co-opt preman or strongmen, it did create the conditions whereby a preman's strength was highly dependent upon their networks of political patronage: a metaphorical 'leash' that could be pulled when necessary. Without this patronage they were vulnerable to state sanction, but also the wrath of those upon whom they preyed, or their rivals. Organisations provided a necessary 'cover'. This also allowed the state to divide economic spoils, whilst still appearing at least partially to fulfil some of the constraints placed upon the modern state, such as providing the conditions for economic prosperity and to mediate problems of poverty and distress among the larger population.

The possibility that the cultivation of criminal networks by political elites and the military could result in the development of rival power bases as much as it could bolster state power was managed by Suharto by encouraging rivalries and power struggles between groups. In this way the kind of warlordism and 'bossism' found in the Philippines and Thailand was avoided (Sidel 1999). It was a recurrent but unrealised fear of the New Order that preman could form broader structural networks similar to the Yakuza or Sicilian Mafia which could coalesce into a significant challenge to its monopolisation of resource extraction. At the times when such networks appeared possible, the state intervened dramatically and brutally to reassert its power. Hence the existence of preman served a dual political purpose that reflected the double-edged nature of protection as described by Tilly. Informally they were an integral part of the mechanisms of power, while formally they could be invoked as a threat from which society needed to be protected. As long as groups remained relatively atomised and/or firmly under the reign of military loyal to Suharto they were left for the most part undisturbed, an inherently unstable balancing act that brought with it the danger that the state could itself be revealed as criminal and 'criminalised'.

The New Order's 'crisis of hegemony' was for most of its 32 years of rule a manufactured one, a quintessential racket. As Lindsey has argued, in order to justify its extra-legal 'order', the regime invoked a protracted state of 'imminent crisis', initially from the threat of communism and later from *gali* (*gabungan anak liar*, literally 'gangs of wild children') and preman, before finally it became almost spectral, such as in so-called 'Organisations Without

Form' (*Organisasi Tanpa Bentuk*, or OTB). The result was that the state became in this sense 'an enterprise that operated on the same basis as criminals' (Lindsey 2001, 289). This criminal nature of the state was also in functional terms as it used the same methods of extortion, racketeering, violence and secrecy as the preman gangs that it employed. Via state-backed subterfuge, including the use of preman as agents provocateurs to discredit opposition movements, the New Order sought to give the impression that without strict controls, society would descend into chaos. The New Order's racket system was multilayered and the relationship between its component parts complex. The state-gang relationship of the late 1980s has often been categorised as one of *beking* or 'backing', described by Lindsey as a 'delicate mechanism' whereby preman gangs became part of the grass-roots structure of state power (Lindsey 2006, 32). It was in practice a privatisation of state power, which allowed the state to distance itself from excesses conducted on its behalf, whilst making use of gangs as a mode of social control and rent extraction. For the gangs themselves, such arrangements were ultimately pragmatic, opening up the opportunity for economic advantage and political advancement, and reduced the risk of becoming a target of state pogroms.

This book suggests that to understand the relationship between state and non-state entrepreneurs in violence in contemporary Indonesia and the role of informal coercive authority in political life, the model of the protection racket, and its extension in the protection racket state as outlined by Tilly and Schulte-Bockholt, provides a useful conceptual framework. As a conceptual framework the protection racket helps to readjust attention on the quotidian level, away from a state-centric focus upon laws, legislation, state institutions and ideal-type models of state and government, towards the way power and authority is manufactured and exercised in local arenas and how this connects to other arenas. The world of preman and jago is the streets, neighbourhoods and kampung, an 'arena of contestation' in which state and non-state power is constituted and put into effect. For this reason the study of preman, local strongmen and violent entrepreneurs provides a revealing micro-level window into the dynamics of New Order and post-New Order politics.

It is also suggested that despite the existence of a powerful centralised state and its appearance as a coherent and autonomous actor, the New Order was characterised in practice by a particular kind of 'precariousness' – a complex balancing act in which numerous state agents and non-state actors using violence were engaged in rivalries, negotiations, opportunistic alliances, and stratagems for expanding and consolidating power and financial gain: a society of rackets. These rivalries tended to be obscured by the ideological backdrop of the image of a powerful unitary state that was mediated by the dominating figure of Suharto. Rackets and extortion are in practice inherently unstable, what Humphrey describes as 'at once expansive and implosive' and predicated upon an absence of trust (Humphrey 1999, 210). The most telling evidence of this in Indonesia has been the speed with which these networks of rackets and beking patronage unravelled, fragmented and were reconfigured

after Suharto's departure. Placed in this context, the proliferation of organised preman and rackets in post-New Order Indonesia can be understood as a new political economy of protection, in both its benign and threatening sense, emerging from this unravelling and subsequent abundance of 'supply'.

'Protection' as an imposed form of exchange exists in organised rackets, informal security groups, mass organisations and localised territorial monopolies over coercion, but has also surfaced on a variety of new 'frontiers of legitimacy' which reflect the decentralised environment, electoral democracy, the emergence of populist and identity politics and opening of markets. It is found in the rights claims on behalf of marginalised social and economic groups, political constituencies and alliances in the context of electoral politics and regional autonomy, turf wars between state agencies, big business and political parties, 'morality rackets' and forms of religious and 'law and order' vigilantism, and in the demands of the market for private security and coercive extra-legal forms of conflict resolution and contract enforcement. One product of the opening up of markets, the increasingly free-floating world of business and its globalisation and the so-called 'retreat of the state' has been an increase in opportunities for violent entrepreneurs and more ambiguous relations with capital. Organised violence may have collapsed as a centralised state strategy, but it has re-emerged as a commodity and form of political and social capital used by various individual and group actors for the pursuit and protection of a variety of social, economic and political interests.

Facing something closer to an actual as opposed to manufactured 'crisis of hegemony' due to the unpredictability of political fortunes in the post-New Order environment, political elites have turned to preman and violent entrepreneurs to defend or maintain their economic and political interests. This has been amplified by the morphing of struggles for social power into more diffuse forms, such as local party politics, direct elections and populist mass organisations. This pattern finds its historical origins in the New Order; however, state agents and many elites no longer possess access to the same coercive means they once did. Military figures infamous for their patronage of particular gangs have conceded that in the post-New Order political environment they are not capable of exercising 'control' as they once did.[13] The fragmenting of central state power together with the fracturing of social power and the rise of new social forces has created an open, dynamic and at times unstable market in violent entrepreneurship and political brokerage. As a result, preman, strongmen and other violent entrepreneurs are often able to negotiate on their own terms, in some instances transforming from sub-hegemonic groups and middle men to significant political actors in their own right, albeit within a different field of power and influence from that of the legislature.

Notes

1 These go under a variety of regional names such as the *jago, lenggaong* and *jagabaya* of central Java, the *warok* of Ponorogo, *Blater* of Madura, *parewa* of West

Sumatra the *jawara* of Banten and Jakarta, the *jeger* of West Java, and the *bajingan, gali* and *preman* of modern urban centres nationwide, to name but a few. Each of these figures and groups possesses its own distinct history and connotations that range from criminal, strongman, local leader and security guard to martial arts master. On *warok*, for example, see Wilson 1999.

2 The term 'violent entrepreneurs' used throughout this book is derived from the work of Blok (1988) and Volkov (2002). Volkov defines violent entrepreneurship as 'a set of organizational solutions and action strategies that convert organized force (or organized violence) into money or other valued assts on a permanent basis' (Volkov 2002, 27). The term is a particularly useful one in the context of Indonesia as it avoids the conceptual ambiguities linked to normative notions of non-state violence and its attendant issues of legality and legitimacy.

3 On this point in relation to Southeast Asia, see Day 2002, 229–36.

4 This includes mercenaries, bandits and irregular armed forces that have so often been crucial to the formation of nation-states. See Davis and Pereira 2003.

5 Migdal's critique was less one of Weber's definition of the state as it was of its reception in the social sciences. As he explained, 'the assumption that only the state does, or should, create rules and that only it does, or should, maintain the violent means to bend people to obey those rules minimizes or trivializes the rich negotiation, interaction and resistance that occur in every society among multiple systems of rules' (Migdal 2001, 15).

6 Migdal also goes further than Taylor or Tilly in his recognition that the state is 'a contradictory entity that acts against itself', and neither a seamless nor autonomous actor.

7 See, for example, the various contributors in Koonings and Kruijt 2004.

8 A similar meaning is attached to *warok*, the strongmen from Ponorogo, East Java, which is said to originate from the Javanese words *uwal* and *rokan*, meaning to be one free from forced labour (Wilson 1999).

9 The situation was similar in other parts of the country. In Bali, for example, Robinson (1995) describes how gangs consisting of former guerrillas operated with virtual impunity, meting out justice to those considered collaborators or political opponents.

10 Imam Sjafe'i was the quintessential jago, with close links to political elites as well as the criminal world. He made the transition from criminal boss to laskar leader, and then to a military commander in the Siliwangi Division. He was appointed minister of state for people's security by Sukarno in 1966. He was detained when the New Order came to power, after which PI was forcibly disbanded. Many former members joined *Pemuda Pancasila*.

11 Interview with Irwan Sjafi'i, a former member of *Kobra*, Jakarta, 2006.

12 Nasution established army-civilian cooperation bodies, and instigated working links with *Ansor* (the youth wing of the Islamic organisation Nahd'atul Ulama), as well as the youth groups of the PKI, PNI (*Partai Nasionalis Indonesia*, or Indonesian Nationalist Party) and Masyumi. This 'cooperation' was later articulated in the 'doctrine of territorial warfare' (*doktrin perang wilayah*) that was devised in 1958 by a military panel appointed by Nasution. Ostensibly devised as a defensive strategy against external attack, the doctrine outlined the military's role as one of managing and coordinating all aspects of national life in order to ensure stability.

13 Interview with former army general, Jakarta, 2006.

2 Reconfigured rackets
Continuity, change and consolidation

How do the concepts discussed in the previous chapter help provide a framework for understanding preman politics, violent entrepreneurs and informal coercive authority within the context of post-New Order Jakarta? If we accept Horkheimer's contention that rackets are an 'archetype of domination' that manifest in accord with the particularistic conditions of a time and place, what forms have rackets taken, and how have they changed and interacted with other rackets? Can we best understand current manifestations of organised militias and violent entrepreneurship as predatory vehicles for primitive accumulation set within a broader field of social conflicts between competing interests? Is this the inevitable product of the undoing of the New Order protection racket regime, and in what ways has the dynamics of Indonesia's democratisation and decentralisation transformed the informal authority of local strongmen into forms of populist or even representational politics?

What the Jakarta case studies suggest is that it is less a case of an unravelling of the state as a coherent coercive entity, but of its image as such, revealing the complex local matrices of power and struggles for authority that collectively constituted it. The actual or claimed ability to organise and mediate between the 'informal proletariat' of Jakarta's sprawling urban kampung and government is a valuable form of social and political capital in the context of a multiparty electoral democracy, and a city administration in need of partners to assist in governing its ever expanding urban population. This has seen the emergence of new types of political entrepreneurs and mass organisations that reflect a particular kind of populist political agency of the urban poor and working class shaped by democratisation while still informed by the logics of coercive territorial politics and obsession with monopolisation normalised during the New Order. Just as government and elite interests have sought to appropriate local authority, so the urban poor and working class have looked to it as a means to protect and assert their own interests, rights and desires for material improvement.

The fragmenting and resulting 'patchiness' of state power and presence post-Suharto has resulted in the fracturing of social power, the rise of new social forces and a proliferation of what has been described as 'conflicts between different coalitions of state and social power' (Hadiz and Robison

2004, 31). Hadiz and Robison have argued that the end of centralised authoritarian rule did not, as was hoped in some quarters, result in the consolidation of progressive liberal civil society or popular mass organisations of the poor and working class (Hadiz and Robison 2004, 31). The reasons for this, they suggest, were the replacement of authoritarianism with fragmented forms of government rather than institutions able to provide the guarantees needed for the enforcement of rights considered essential to the development of a liberal civil society, and the failure of any progressive-middle class alliance to enforce legal-rationale modes of governance (Hadiz and Robison 2004, 31). Without institutional transformation, 'the broader liberal agenda was soon submerged by wide ranging social violence and coercion by gangs and criminal elements'; the interplay between 'liberal' economic power resulting from the introduction of markets and the 'illiberal' social power identified created a space in which gangsters have been able to flourish (Hadiz and Robison 2004, 31).

While violent entrepreneurs may have been well equipped to benefit from these conditions, they have been equally susceptible to the unpredictability of the outcomes. To consolidate their position ideological preferences have been adopted. During the New Order this required pledging and displaying an ostensive loyalty to state elites: Suharto, the military, Golkar and the state ideology of Pancasila which together constituted the image of the state as unified and omnipresent. However in the 'post-Pancasila' environment it has taken on more diverse forms including alignment with political parties, business interests, organisations based around ethnic or religious identity, as well as those claiming to represent social and economic underclasses. Commercial and market forces have also become increasingly important. The overall picture that emerges is similar to what Migdal referred to as a 'melange' of various social forces, classes, organisations and interests in competition with one another at various levels, ranging from the local to the national (Migdal 2001, 118). Yet despite this, we have not witnessed a descent into 'all against all', suggesting the salience and continuity of deeper structures and logics of power.

There have been a number of studies examining the informal coercive authority represented by the preman and other violent entrepreneurs in the post-New Order period. Lindsey, for example, has argued that post-1998 manifestations of preman violence are a continuation of practices and strategies consolidated during the New Order (Lindsey 2001, 2006). Using the analogy of the New Order as a powerful mafia, a type of preman state with Suharto as its don, Lindsey suggests that the situation post-New Order is comparable to a mafia without a boss, the fragmented state no longer able to control its former henchmen effectively (Lindsey 2001, 283). He contends that previously state-controlled rackets have been pushed out of the state system and 'privatized', though these are often still controlled by elements of the old regime (Lindsey 2001, 292). Indonesian scholarship and media analysis have largely focused upon the application of patron-client models for

understanding organised preman or *premanisme*, emphasising the identification of networks of financial and political backers, or viewing preman and mass organisation primarily as a problem of governance and inadequate law enforcement (Simanjuntak 2007). Gunawan and Patria (2000) have highlighted the role of elements of the military in directing preman violence towards the needs of the state, such as in the mobilisation of militias in East Timor and Jakarta, whereas the criminologist Adrianus Meliala describes preman as a criminal social underclass produced by post-New Order social and economic conditions creating poverty and unemployment (Meliala 1998).[1]

Masaaki and Rozaki (2006) have contended that the post-1998 'retreat of the state' has been accompanied by a proliferation of violent entrepreneurs competing to fill the resulting 'governance void' and emergent privatised market in protection. Placing these new forms of violent entrepreneurship within the context of what they argue is a 'stagnating' process of democratisation, they suggest that the paradigm of 'good governance' promoted by international funding agencies has created an opening for violent entrepreneurs via its emphasis upon 'stakeholder' involvement in areas such as security, and second how, unlike their predecessors, the new generation of army officers is not familiar with strategies for domesticating non-state sources of violence. The consequences, they argue, have been the increasing prominence of violent entrepreneurs and strongmen on the local political stage, and the absence of any social or political force capable of effectively curtailing them. Hamid and Masaaki (2008) detail how, once freed from the constraints of loyalty to Golkar, jawara violent entrepreneurs in the new province of Banten have been able to gain a stranglehold over local politics and resources, while MacDougall (2007) describes the emergence of *Pamswakarsa* militias in Lombok using coercive strength to define and enforce local forms of 'law and order'. Hadiz and Robison (2003) and also Ryter (2009) have made similar observations in the case of Medan, identifying how the decentralised setting for struggles over power has seen local strongmen using their experience under the New Order to gain seats in parliament and executive positions within government, from where they can distribute resources and turf to their 'constituents'.

Since 1998, Ryter suggests, preman have been forced to remain 'flexible enough to follow the newly powerful', aligning themselves with those social and political forces they believed would come out on top (Ryter, 2005). This identifies an important aspect of post-New Order preman, namely their efforts at 'repackaging' and making themselves useful to new social and political forces. Barker (2009), in his study of informal power and authority in a Bandung slum, argues that local strongmen cultivated by the New Order state have been replaced by a new, more entrepreneurial type of informal leader whose political capital derives from the ability to organise street workers and mediate between the slum and the state. Their authority is built less on violence or coercion than 'appeals to narrowly defined economic interests' (Barker 2009, 72).

What these studies suggest is that insofar as they constitute localised forms of informal authority and power, preman and local strongmen can be co-opted or subcontracted as extensions of state or elite power, become brokers between the state and the streets, or attempt to use this power to subvert or challenge state interests in the pursuit of their own.[2] To the extent that they are from a social and economic underclass, or claim to be its representative, they may also mobilise to contest power locally as a means to seek resolutions to conditions of material deprivation for particular communities or constituents. With this blurring of categories and interests, not only between types of violence-wielding groups but also between state agents and the groups themselves, ambiguities emerge regarding their direction as either 'top-down' or 'bottom up'. What we can observe is less a reordering of hierarchy, than the opening up of a more complex field of players: agents linked to political elites and groups instrumentalised to defend their interests, predatory and criminal groups exploiting lapses and gaps in state authority, and also grass-roots responses to 'crises of hegemony', not of elites but of disaffected social groups. Elements of each can also be found within an organisation at different times and places.

The presence of these kinds of formations, which as we saw in the previous chapter has been almost constant since colonial times, cannot be explained in and of itself as a manifestation of some Weberian-like 'failure' of the state to monopolise force, 'governance voids', or normative and often idealised notions of a 'partial' as compared to 'comprehensive' process of democratic transition. As Hagedorn has argued, gangs and groups of armed men are a permanent fixture of urban landscapes globally, be it in highly institutionalised or new democracies, authoritarian regimes or so-called fragile states (Hagedorn 2008). In Indonesia, in particular, the mixed outcomes in bringing economic prosperity to rural areas have seen a continuing stream of migration into national and regional capitals, putting increased pressure on limited infrastructure and expanding crowded urban slums and poor neighbourhoods. Often with minimal effective state presence in terms of basic infrastructure or services, gangs, vigilantes and mass social organisations can constitute forms of informal governance, a source of social welfare, identity and group solidarity. This increases where the presence of government is felt in largely negative terms, such as in forced evictions, police corruption or a lack of health, sanitation or education facilities, where these groups may be one of few organisational vehicles available through which to lobby or pressure for improvements. It is significant to note in this respect how in the industrial estates of Bekasi, bordering Jakarta, that while a growing trade union movement has become a significant vehicle for political representation for manufacturing workers, organisations such as the FBR and FPI draw their members overwhelmingly from those working in the informal street economy. Fragmented economic interests and resentments, which are often ethnicised, help to explain how these groups can be mobilised against what could appear to be the collective material interests of their own constituents (Wilson 2014).

With this in mind, there are a number of themes that I argue are important for understanding the complex politics of preman and violent entrepreneurs in post-New Order Jakarta: first, the adjusting to, and as, changing forms of social and political power; second, processes of urbanisation, exclusion and operating in an informal society; and third, the necessity within a decentralised and democratised environment for establishing new forms of rule-making legitimacy for rackets. In the context of these understandings we can identify a loose typology of preman organisations and the *modes of legitimation* for rackets in terms of vigilantism and 'morality racketeering', as forms of social welfare, self-organisation and representation for social and economic underclasses, as new configurations of identity politics in localised territorial struggles over power and resources, and as a product of poorly regulated markets and the subsequent demand for violent entrepreneurship, protection and security.

Adjusting to power

As Hadiz and Robison have detailed, the fall of Suharto, while resulting in a collapse and dispersal of centralised state power, did not result in its complete demise. Rather it 'opens the door to a fresh round of struggles to reshape and redefine economics and politics' (Hadiz and Robison 2004, 31). The end of the New Order in 1998 was heralded as the beginning of a new democratic phase in Indonesia's political history. Institutional reforms took place, most crucially the implementation of political decentralisation and regional autonomy laws plus the hosting of multi-party elections; however, the weak governments that followed Suharto's departure, the intensification of political and economic rivalries coupled with the often chaotic scramble to secure access to resources, all contributed to the disruption of patron-client links and established rackets but without institutions or social forces capable of preventing their reconfiguration. Oligarchic elements of the old regime have been able successfully to reinvent themselves and re-establish economic and political power relationships within formally democratic institutional arrangements and market economies (Hadiz and Robison 2004, 10). Perhaps the greatest constraining or regulating factor has been competition and struggles amongst each other.

This has also applied to the lower levels of the New Order's structure of rackets, including political gangsters and local strongmen, who have emerged as potential beneficiaries of reforms introduced to decentralise power and the opportunities presented by electoral-based politics (Hadiz 2003). Increased fiscal and law-making autonomy to regional and local government, for example, has led to gangsters and violent entrepreneurs becoming valuable forms of political capital, similar to their ancestors, the jago of the colonial period. In instances where the position of elites is tenuous, the local territorial power and authority of violent entrepreneurs has meant that elites have at times been forced to make political and economic concessions in order to

secure their muscle and networks. The implications of this are that rather than operating as the subcontracted foot soldiers of elites, they have in some instances successfully reconfigured themselves in line with the changed political format in ways that have seen them emerge as sources of authority and representation beyond their immediate territory. In Chapter 6, for example, it is shown how through 'gang franchising' city-wide networks are established linking localised gangs that have the potential, albeit often overstated, for mobilising significant numbers of people during elections. With this political capital, organisations managing these networks have been able to make demands on behalf of a constituency and cut deals with political parties and presidential candidates eager to harness what they believe to be their vote-garnering capacity.

What does this mean for understanding preman politics in post-New Order Indonesia? It suggests that accommodation to changes in power results in forms of organisation and practices that can be categorised on this basis. Like their predecessors, many violent entrepreneurs have affiliated with state-registered social and religious organisations. These organisations, which previously pledged allegiance to the state, military and Suharto, now commonly cite communal affiliation as a core identity, often linked to particular sets of political and economic interests. Preman also accommodate political parties, making themselves useful in the complex battles over votes and revenue sources. Other social groups have borrowed from the preman's repertoire, using 'uncivil interaction' and strategies of coercion and intimidation to pursue and protect their own particularistic interests. Decentralisation, regional autonomy and the broadening and consolidation of electoral politics have provided not only a new socio-political reality, but also a new discursive framework in which gangs, vigilantes, violent entrepreneurs and street organisations may articulate and stake territorial claims based upon communal identities, populist rights claims for social and economic groups, and critiques of the state and elites, rather than vertical lines of political patronage and defence of elite ideology and interests. There has been a direct and enthusiastic engagement with democracy and electoral politics in a diverse number of ways.

Urbanisation, exclusion and the search for security

In order to understand this adjusting to power, it is also necessary to situate it spatially within the broader context of the strains and fault lines resulting from the economic, social and political processes that together shape Jakarta's urban environment. Jakarta shows two sets of seemingly opposed but deeply intertwined forces and flows shaping the spatial terrain of the city. One is that of the huge population of the poor, working class and lower-middle classes that make up the majority of the city's population, many first-generation migrants. Around 60–70% of Jakarta's total population live in kampung – informal and largely unplanned enclaves of deeply entangled and heterogeneous social and economic relations.[3] The urban expansion of Jakarta and

the satellite cities of Bekasi, Depok, Tangerang and Bogor resulted in the 'greater Jakarta' region or Jabotabek, with a current population of around 28 million. Since the 1960s Indonesia's economic growth was characterised by the conversion of agricultural lands to urban use. Urbanisation was driven by rural underdevelopment, domestic industrialisation and flows of foreign investment into the capital. The absorptive capacity of what existed of a formal economy was quickly overwhelmed, leading to pervasive under-employment and reliance of those displaced by inner-city development as well as rural-to-urban migrants on various forms of informal economic activity, within urban settlements that lacked basic infrastructure or security of tenure. Kampung residents span from the abject poor to the lower-middle class and those whose economic circumstances fluctuate on a daily basis. Often identified as slums, they range from densely crowded ramshackle bricolage communities clustered along riverbanks and railroad tracks or on squatted government or privately owned land, to more well-established and -maintained mixed-income neighbourhoods with access to basic state-provided infrastructure. Jakarta has been a city shaped and defined by migration and massive movements of people seeking if not a better then at least a very different 'Indonesian' life from that found in rural areas.

The other shaping force is that of private sector capital, facilitated by the neoliberal economic expansion that began in the 1980s, facilitating a soaring of land prices and a growing middle class demanding new forms of housing and 'lifestyle' (Firman 2004). The centre of Jakarta was transformed into a gentrified space for high-rise business towers, exclusive residential areas and spaces of consumption. Many of the middle class moved to the fringes and peri-urban regions of the city to find more space, better amenities and improved standards of living within gated communities and housing estates, where they lived alongside but increasingly separate from kampung residents displaced from the centre, together with continuing waves of new economic migrants from rural areas (Firman 2004). A process of increasing 'enclavisation' of the middle and upper-middle classes and elites occurred, as an intentional segregation due to fears of informal settlements as sources of crime and disorder, as well as a type of privatised self-governance with the private provision of amenities and facilities within gated communities due to the lack of municipal services provided by the state (Leisch 2002). In Jakarta, as Zhu (2010) has noted, the growth of informal communities together with segregated ones has gone hand in hand with reductions in the number of mixed-income neighbourhoods.

Urban policy has maintained a thread of continuity from the colonial administration, into the post-independence period and the present, with its overarching goal the transformation of space as an arena for market-orientated growth for private capital and the consumptive practices of elites and a middle class, whilst securing order and degrees of control amongst the vast underclass populations. This spatial and infrastructural divide increased during the New Order, with kampung dwellers and the poor seen as

obstructions to realising modern urban development, rather than its object or beneficiary. In the words of former governor Ali Sadikin, the urban poor were 'those with no skill', who are lacking 'consciousness of the law' or 'urban rationality' (Kusno 2004). The 'epidemic potential' of the street as a generative site for social and political dissent also loomed large in the minds of the regime, who implemented a range of government rationalities designed to ensure 'nothing happens'.

'Illegality' is in this context structurally determined, and defined largely by social class. The informal street economy, for example, is criminalised via public order laws, in doing so creating protection economies in which local bureaucrats, police and gangsters can subject the informal street workers to overlapping layers of rents and fees, paid often with the hope that in doing so they may be afforded some level of security or sense of reciprocal obligation in the absence of citizens' rights. Informal settlements by their nature are tenuous. Securing a space in the city requires the cultivation and constant tending of numerous specific and intersecting relationships (Simone 2013). Even though generosity, reciprocity and forms of solidarity remain strong in many kampung and street economies as well as the inventive redistribution of social goods, alliances and affiliations amongst neighbours can also be volatile and marked by intense competition. Perceptions of tenuousness are often uneven, and social and economic networks heterogeneous, partly explaining why Jakarta has not seen the kinds of urban poor social movements that have emerged in other megacities. Collective mobilisation when it occurs is usually spontaneous, direct and in response to perceptions of common threat, such as the eviction of a kampung or street-trader hub. Inter-generational poverty, the relative absence of identifiable prospects for social advancement, the precariousness of livelihood and status as 'partial citizens' make the urban poor vulnerable and subject to structural violence: social structures or institutions that create harm by preventing them from meeting basic needs. It is within the context of these material and spatial conditions that gangs and mass organisations are often perceived by urban poor youth as an avenue for political participation, collective identities and strategies. Attempts to address a profound sense of social exclusion, alongside material deprivation, was a recurring theme in interviews with young kampung men as to why they became involved or affiliated with gangs or mass organisations, as was a search for 'respect'.[4] It was seen as a 'way up' and a 'way out', less in terms of class advancement, than of increased prestige and authority within the kampung.

Many gangs in Jakarta have been shaped, if not created, by these processes of exclusion, migration and the need to negotiate a secure place in the city. Ambonese, Timorese and Papuan gangs, for example, have grown out of family networks, clan ties and flows of migration into the capital. A successful charismatic figure known to families in their hometown, such as Hercules, John Kei or Ongen Sangaji, is often the first port of call for new young arrivals to Jakarta: someone who can provide access to a network of solidarity, a place to stay, backup when there is trouble, and potential work.[5] The leaders

of Betawi organisations – those citing an 'indigenous' identity as Jakarta's original inhabitants – have invoked an historical experience of social and spatial exclusion on the part of the largely working-class *Betawi Pinggir* in the east of the city, which is projected into present economic pressures, contests over informal markets and the politicisation of space.

Manufacturing legitimacy

How then have rackets been transformed, and upon what kinds of material and ideological basis have they been established? As has been mentioned, post-New Order governments attempted to resolve criticisms against the previous centralised patronage network of the state via the introduction of government decentralisation and regional autonomy reforms in 2001. In theory, this devolving of power was expected to help foster local leadership and bring government 'closer to the people'. It has undoubtedly done this, though often in unanticipated ways. The argument here focuses upon the extent to which it has provided the opportunity for a new quasi-legitimacy to relations of resource distribution, and allowed coercive local interests to consolidate control over resources and markets without institutional checks or rule of law. Rather than producing the 'good governance' ideal of local 'managers' the outcome has been a proliferation of 'local kings', albeit ones far less entrenched or violent as the warlord clans of the Philippines described by Sidel (1999) and Kreuzer (2009).[6] Focusing on the reconfiguring and contesting of patronage and political authority at the local level allows us to see the extent to which control of the streets was in effect up for grabs as space opened for organised preman and violent entrepreneurs to emerge as a new nexus of predatory interest and social and economic power. The model of the territorial gang, which protects its constituents while preying upon its neighbours, has translated well in the context of intensified local political struggles and party-based political rivalries. Both nationally and locally politicians and elites have attempted to harness this territorial power, recognising, like the New Order, the utilitarian value of local informal power holders. As this book will show, the outcomes of these kinds of relationships have not always been as expected.

By focusing on the types of relationships and alliances that have developed between local elites, violent entrepreneurs, local populations and their actual practices, we are able to categorise different forms of racket and what Schulte-Bockholt has called 'the establishment of repressive forms of socio-economic order' (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 36). Here it is worth recalling his thesis that in elite-organised crime partnerships formed during a 'crisis of hegemony', the degree of integration of organised crime into power structures is determined by the needs of elites themselves. However, the dynamics in Indonesia are different from those outlined by Schulte-Bockholt in a number of ways. Most importantly, elites are not as easily able to use the state apparatus to repress or remove violent entrepreneurs with any degree of predictability, outsourcing

this role to private actors. As a result, violent entrepreneurs, who are frequently called upon by local elites to harass and suppress counter-hegemonic forces such as a revitalised labour movement or political rivals, have been able to use their prime instrumentality in the establishment and preservation of particular configurations of interest to become equal and at times dominant partners in these alliances rather than merely 'hired goons'. Miscalculations on the part of local elites and government have aided, perhaps unwittingly, in the evolution of these organisations and networks into significant constellations of social and political power. At the local level this has resulted in new spaces for engagement and the exercise of influence by social groups previously largely excluded from the political process.

A problematic aspect of Schulte-Bockholt's argument when applied to post-New Order Indonesia is that it does not adequately address the diversity of organised non-state violence-wielding groups, adopting a reductionist view of racketeers as essentially primitive forms of totalitarian states, reactionary forms of organisation which ultimately seek to impose repressive socio-political orders, and who only become ideological 'by adapting to the world view prevalent in the elite structures into which they integrate' (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 22). As Sanchez-Jankowski has noted, there has often been a failure to differentiate criminal groups and gangs from other types of collective behaviour and organisation, or recognise the extent to which they are influenced by the larger structures within which they operate (Sanchez-Jankowski 2003, 191). In practice, the distinctions between gang, militia, vigilante, protection racketeers, social organisations or state agent are often at best arbitrary, with the realities involving complex networks of intertwined sets of interests, goals and identities that shift and morph in accord with changing social and political dynamics. The capacity of these actors to expand and consolidate their interests has been linked to the changed political format, but it is also suggested that this results from tapping into deep-seated resentments over the economic and social disparities stemming from the perceived failure of the post-New Order state to provide the kind of socioeconomic prosperity for which many, in particular the poor and working class, had hoped. This forms the basis in which territorial claims can be articulated and staked based upon communal identities and populist rights demands of various social groups based in critiques of the state, rather than one-way vertical lines of political patronage and defence of state ideology.

While relationships with state actors remain important to survival and success and offer degrees of 'invulnerability' from the law and official sanction, faced with political unpredictability and stiff competition, new frameworks for legitimising localised monopolies have emerged. Within a social field with a multitude of actors competing for access to resources and territory, coercive force in and of itself is rarely sufficient to establish any enduring monopoly or even niche. Subsequently articulating modes of legitimation for rackets and privileged access to rents and resources have become an important part of local and city-wide struggles. The specific composition and

strength of groups that come to dominate a particular racket will determine both its nature and the way it conducts itself (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 35). Taking also the contention that organised rackets assume ideological preferences in order to facilitate integration within existing power structures, examination of the ideological rationales, legitimations and various 'images' adopted by preman for underpinning informal authority, and the composition and operational logic of these rackets, affords some revealing, important insights into the contours of local politics. In the case of Jakarta, a number of Weberian-like 'legitimations for domination' in the establishment and monopolising of rackets can be identified. These articulate and correlate to some defining features of the post-New Order political landscape in Jakarta and are useful in helping to identify the ways in which localised forms of social order have been produced, reproduced and contested within the institutional structure of electoral democracy.[7] While these are presented as discrete categories, observation suggests that in practice there are often significant degrees of blurriness and overlap even within any one gang or organisation.

Vigilantism and 'morality racketeering'

One claim to legitimacy is the contention that the post-New Order state has failed in its responsibility to provide physical safety, economic and moral security to its citizens, hence the need for them to protect themselves in the form of organised vigilantes and militias, a number of which are national in scope.[8] Community policing is by no means a new phenomenon, nor the local administering of justice, and has long been welcomed in official quarters as a 'cost-effective' form of policing with vigilantes supplementing an overstretched police. It can also be a vehicle by which residents resist the encroachment of new and threatening social, economic and demographic forces into the fabric of kampung life.[9] Abrahams proposes that vigilantism exists on so-called 'frontiers' of state authority that can be understood in terms of geographical fringes, but also in more abstract 'frontiers of legitimacy' where the state is judged not only in relation to degrees of institutional or infrastructural presence but by the perceived ability to articulate and at least nominally enforce a moral or social order and ideas of justice that are recognised by significant sections of the population (Abrahams 1998). When 'gaps' emerge between institutional practices and moral orders, as is common in times of rapid social and political change, vigilantism often emerges as a response. In this regard organised vigilantes can be understood not as a problem of governance, but a type of local governance based around particular moral economies, which together constitute what Barker has described as a 'patchwork of de facto jurisdictions' (Barker 2007, 93).

One prevalent form of organised vigilantism in Jakarta is what I refer to as 'morality racketeering'. Like the classic racket, it involves creating or exaggerating a threat that those invoking it are strategically placed to resolve. Largely eschewing the traditional staples of criminal gangs such as

prostitution, gambling and narcotics, the new breed of 'moral' racketeers nonetheless benefit from the existence of illicit economies by positing themselves as a protector of the community against the dangers posed by them. Appealing to normative social and religious values and often genuine concerns over the encroachment of illicit industries into kampung life, morality racketeers gain a strategic moral high ground as protectors of the virtuous community, in turn legitimising forms of territorial power and authority to police. Raids against places of 'sin' and 'vice' (*maksiat*) serve as 'law-making' violence, often quite literally insofar as vigilante actions by the FPI, FBR and others have been able to pressure governments to pass legislation that they are best positioned to enforce, such as restricting the sale of alcohol or banning pornography (Wilson 2008). Morality racketeering has become an effective and powerful form of political capital. This has seen vigilante groups move to the forefront of broader social and political coalitions, become 'partners' with local government and, in the words of Yudhoyono government Home Minister Gamawan Fauzi, 'a national asset'.[10]

Within the context of contingent power relations morality racketeering plays out locally in different ways. Businesses may, for example, pay vigilantes 'haram levies' in order that they will not be targeted, while 'sinful' bars and clubs linked to powerful military figures may be overlooked. Insofar as 'vice' is rhetorically associated with social and economic class, such as the consumptive lifestyles of the city's liberal and secular upper-middle class, broader class resentments can also be mobilised, a dimension of the rise of grass-roots conservative Islam in urban Indonesia that has received little serious analysis (Hadiz 2011b, Wilson 2014). Identifying ethnic and religious minorities with moral decay or sources of maksiat has also been a means of shifting balances of power in local contestations over space and resources.

Social welfare and political representation

Like their predecessors the *Pemuda Pancasila* (PP) and *Pemuda Panca Marga* (PM), post-New Order groups in Jakarta such as the FBR, *Forkabi, Ikatan Keluarga Betawi* (IKB), *Macan Kebayoran* and others claim to be performing a social service by providing *preman* and unemployed and youth with 'moral guidance', solidarity and opportunities for legitimate livelihood generation in lieu of any state-initiated schemes or social welfare. Similarly, they can claim to be a representative of 'preman' as a stigmatised social class, such as in the case of the FBR who present their members as victims of 'the real preman, the ones wearing ties sitting in parliament'.[11]

Security and the provision of 'protection' is usually considered the most suitable employment for those whose primary social capital is considered to be a skill in the use of coercion. The logic reproduces a pattern of state-gang relations in which the best way to fight 'crime' is by recruiting its potential or actual perpetrators, thereby redrawing the boundaries of who and what can be defined as 'criminal'. In this way organisations can easily disavow the

excesses of its membership as the work of 'rogue individuals' (*oknum*) that have yet to complete the conversion process, while reaffirming the important social welfare function they claim to be providing. Outcomes are also not necessarily malevolent, reactionary or self-serving. As we shall see in the rise of Betawi organisations, microcredit and job-seeking schemes, legal advocacy, and self-help programmes are as much a part of many of these groups as are the thuggery and rent seeking for which they are infamous.[12] As far as preman groups and organisations may be predatory, they also contain internal contradictions that derive from the tensions between these modes of racket legitimisation, the desire for political representation and sustainable livelihood strategies of members, and the political aspirations and interests of their leaders and elite clients. Similarly, the legal status of many of these groups as societal organisations (*organisasi masyarakat*, or *ormas*), a legacy of the New Order obsession with social control, should not be immediately dismissed as window dressing (Wilson and Nugroho 2012).[13]

Analysis of the politics of gangs often operates from an assumption that ideological components, where they are present, are a front for criminality (Brotherton and Barrios 2004, 38–53). The case studies here suggest that the relationship is far more complex, and not reducible to a simple dichotomy between self-interested pragmatism and ideological commitment (Brown and Wilson 2007). It is the interplay between attempts to address the material needs of the group or community (which can include but are not limited to criminality) and the pursuing of previously inaccessible avenues for the realisation of the aspirations of members that has contributed to significant increases in membership despite the existence of other types of 'representative' organisation, such as political parties, NGOs, etc. The work of scholars such as Brotherton and Barrios (2004, 2007) provides valuable conceptual frames for understanding how gangs, vigilante groups or militias can be concurrently violent defenders of predatory interests or criminality, and vehicles for social and cultural resistance by the urban underclass: 'change agents as well as adaptive social animals/groups in the world of highly unequal social relations' (Brotherton and Barrios 2004: 38). The concept of the 'street organisation', 'the transitional stage between a gang and a social movement', was developed by them in the course of ethnographic work on New York gangs to help bridge the gap between gang studies and social movement literature, and is a useful definitional model when considering ormas groups in Jakarta (Brotherton 2007, 252).[14] Some questions that emerge, then, are what have been the outcomes of the ostensive efforts to provide welfare, jobs and political representation to the urban underclasses, and has it led to the formation of alliances with other social and political forces?

Identity politics and territorialism

As has been mentioned, towards the end of the New Order, as the image of a unified regime began to fracture, the ideology and symbolism of many

'entrepreneurs in violence' began to shift away from those linked to this static image of the state and were increasingly derived from communal and sub-national territorial identities. Predatory interest intertwined with the rights claims of ethnic and communal groups and the various 'moral' agendas of a reinvigorated political Islam. The causes for this shift were intertwined with the changing institutional context. The breakup of government into smaller administrative units and the literal redrawing of district and provincial boundaries resulting from decentralisation and regional splitting (known as *pemekaran*) created confusion regarding lines of authority as new provinces came into existence and local government and bureaucratic precincts were altered, and some networks of resource distribution that relied upon state agents were disrupted or excluded by these shifting boundaries (Agustino and Yousoff 2010). Ethnic identities have been politicised as clientelist networks, as actors who felt their interests threatened by these changes sought to reconsolidate power by mobilising support along communal lines. Articulations of ethnicity and localism have been explicitly linked to notions of territory and sets of attendant 'rights' to a monopoly over resources, rents and space.

Even in an historically heterogeneous 'melting-pot' city such as Jakarta, ethnic and religious identities that are often submerged in the complex interactions and relations of daily life have been politicised and used as an organisational pole for contesting territory, defining 'difference' and in doing so redefining who can access what and on what basis. In the context of myriad competing gangs, the reinvention of Jakarta as an ethnic homeland for the Betawi served an important function in legitimating localised rackets and their expansion. The city's administration, struggling to regain control over Jakarta's streets, was quick to recognise the utilitarian value of those citing an 'indigenous' identity, encouraging the consolidation of their rackets over others, and in doing so attempting to recuperate their city-wide networks to shore up electoral support, and as a bulwark against in-city migration.

Through invoking invented or idealised notions of the traditional social order of the urban kampung, ethnicised preman have reified themselves as jawara or 'champions', who through acts of exemplary violence 'make and mark community boundaries' (Sen and Pratten 2007, 11). The proposition presented is that gangs and mass organisations have responded to pressure created by the unpredictable political and socioeconomic environment by representing themselves as an alternative form of social structuration. The FBR have successfully established a city-wide, street-level support base in part by appealing to parochial constructions of ethnic identity intertwined with social class and the territorialisation of space, whereby coercion and racketeering are justified by claims to socioeconomic rights for the politically and socially marginal 'indigenous' community they claim to represent. As the organisation's networks have grown, the 'boundaries' of this community have been redefined and broadened.

The market

In post-Suharto Jakarta security and 'protection' can be an imposed relationship of exchange, but also a commodity demanded by a variety of private and public consumers. The fracturing of previous protection monopolies, including the separation of the police from the military, presented multiple opportunities for those 'with nothing to sell but their own muscles' (Ryter 1998, 49). As has been discussed, a protection racket is in operation when the threat from which protection is sought is either emanating from the protector, or is deliberately manufactured or exaggerated. However, what if the threat is patently real? Protection can then become a genuine and needed commodity. Ongoing gang turf wars, preman violence, petty crime, inter-neighbourhood conflict, business rivalries, and corruption on the part of local officials have created a demand for security and protection as a tradable commodity. There is now a host of registered and informal 'private security' providers, ranging in scope from local gangs, ex-military and police, party-affiliated militias, business offshoots of mass organisations to international security companies servicing the corporate sector. The types of services offered also traverse the 'legal' and 'illegal'. In under-regulated markets marred by corruption and the relative absence of an effective or impartial legal system to settle business disputes, there is high demand for the services of violent entrepreneurs in resolving a variety of 'transactional problems' such as debt recovery, contract enforcement and land brokering. Violent entrepreneurs are an indispensable part of how business is done in the city, fitting a broader pattern identified by Varese (2011) in relation to the structural conditions under which mafias emerge.

As Gambetta has argued in his study of the Sicilian Mafia, consumers of private protection do not necessarily consider themselves to be better off if protection is supplied by the 'legitimate state' (Gambetta 1993, 3). The semi-privatisation of the police through their reliance on off-budget revenue is one factor making other sources of protection appear a desirable or more cost-effective option (Baker 2013). As one popular Jakarta saying goes, 'you lose a chicken and report it to the police, you end up losing a goat'. Lane has proposed that where no one possesses an enduring monopoly over coercive force, merchants and other consumers of protection would avoid over-priced providers when they could obtain protection more cheaply elsewhere (Lane 1979, 52). In Jakarta, insofar as this market can be considered in any way 'rational', it has tended over time to favour those groups that are predictable and well organised. In order to be competitive in such a market, some groups have attempted to transition from street gangs and racketeers into more tightly organised and 'professional' protection organisations to carve out a niche. This has entailed a range of organisational strategies: tightening of membership criteria, the introduction of 'procedural guidelines' and 'rules of engagement', and efforts to negotiate accommodation with other groups non-violently. The inbuilt limits of extortion and intimidation, and the inherent dangers and

instability it brings, has become a factor shaping the consolidation of rackets. In economic terms, there has been recognition that over-reliance on coercion is not a viable long-term strategy in the face of myriad rival providers. If markets in violence do favour gradual monopolisation as it reduces the overall costs of producing protection, several questions emerge that will be examined in Chapter 6: what types of groups have come to dominate protection markets and why, and which organisational and political strategies have been most successful in consolidating protection market niches?

Having outlined some of the main themes of the study together with the various modes of legitimisation for rackets, we return briefly to the question of 'the state'. It is proposed that the gangs, ormas and vigilantes we find in current-day Jakarta have responded to wide-spread disillusionment with the post-New Order state, and structural conditions producing social and political exclusion for the poor, by constructing for themselves a 'state proxy' role. However, this should not be equated with suggesting that they constitute a 'state within a state', similar to the often-cited example of the favela gangs of Rio de Janeiro (Pearlman 2009).[15] Like the state, however, while gangs commonly claim a 'legitimate monopoly' over territory, observation suggests this is usually partial, patchy and limited to specific social and economic spheres. Social welfare provisions are real, but rarely extend to those beyond members, their families and select networks. Protection services aim to exclude competitors, while requiring their existence to be 'legitimate'. Closer to what we see is the projection of images of 'state-ness' and the adoption and adaptation of state-like practices, many derived from the repertoires of the New Order detailed in the next chapter.[16] The 'society of rackets' has been democratised, but also constrained and shaped by the process.

Notes

1 *Kompas* (2005) 'Perang atas preman dimulai', 12 August.
2 As Bertrand (2004b) has noted, attempts by the post-1998 state to harness civilian-based security units, such as in the short-lived *Kamra* security force or the *Pamwakarsa* militias mobilised to counter student demonstrations around the national parliament in 1998, largely backfired due to the inability of the military and police to control them adequately.
3 It has been estimated that up to 80% of housing nationally is 'self-help' based (OHCHR 2013).
4 It is interesting to note that in some poor neighbourhoods musical subcultures such as punk, death metal and grindcore have become a popular alternative for youth to involvement in gangs or mass organisations. In recent years police 'anti-preman' campaigns have specifically targeted youths adopting punk aesthetics, with so called 'anti-punk' raids regularly conducted in Jakarta since 2011, the main subjects of which have been street kids and buskers.
5 Hercules is from East Timor, while John Kei and Ongen Sangaji are from Ambon. All three have been established figures in Jakarta's underworld. A number of Flores and Papuan gang members interviewed had originally come to Jakarta to study, becoming involved in gang activities as a means to earn extra cash to cover Jakarta's high cost of living or due to having got into trouble of some kind.

6 *Jakarta Post* (2008) 'Decentralization breeds local kings', 19 January. One 'success' of Suharto's New Order was preventing the emergence and consolidation of powerful local bosses or clans such as those found in the Philippines.
7 It is important to note that there are, of course, gangs, groups and individuals who are 'purely criminal' insofar as they do not attempt to legitimate their use of violence or engage in any kind of political organisation, such as the *Kapak Merah* ('Red Axe') gang in Jakarta, which specialised in armed holdups at traffic intersections using their signature weapon. While such groups are important and fascinating in their own right, they are not the primary focus of this study.
8 By far the largest being the Front Pembela Islam. See Wilson 2008, 2014.
9 In one neighbourhood visited in North Bekasi, for example, residents joined the Islamic vigilante group, the FPI, not out of any religious conviction, but as a means to rid the neighbourhood of methyl amphetamine dealers.
10 *Jakarta Post* (2013) 'Gamawan describes FPI as an asset to the nation', 25 October.
11 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2007.
12 It was a source of great frustration and bewilderment to a number of liberal non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in Jakarta focused on issues of urban poverty as to why many more of the urban poor joined groups such as the FBR than their own.
13 Introduced in the 1980s, ormas laws required that all civil organisations be registered with the Ministry of Home Affairs, which had the power to disband or outlaw any ormas considered a threat to the national interest.
14 The definitional model of the street organisation they developed consists of a number of aspects: subcultural traditions melding gang and political subcultures, a complexity of organisation and levels of responsibility and accountability of the leadership, a membership with a working-class contingent, a group identity as a movement actor and the development of an ideological belief system, political and oppositional actions that outweigh the importance of criminality, and common perceived adversaries which give the group a political focus beyond turf rivalries (Brotherton and Barrios 2004, 53–54).
15 The autonomy of the favelas and power of their drug gangs have been heavily curtailed since the Brazilian state launched intensive police incursions as part of 'securing' Rio de Janeiro in preparations for the 2014 World Cup (Froio 2014).
16 For example, the former leader of the FBR, Fadloli el-Muhir, frequently travelled in a black Mercedes with FBR flags attached to its hood and flanked by police-style motorbikes emblazoned with the group's logo in what was a clear imitation of a presidential motorcade.

3 A New Order of crime
Suharto's racket regime

From its inception, violence and coercion was at the core of Suharto's New Order. In the wake of one of the biggest blood-lettings of modern history which resulted in the elimination of as many as 1 million of its citizens, the New Order came to power, inspiring the praise and political and financial support of the Western world. As Hilmar Farid (2006) has argued, the history of the New Order *is* the history of violence. Despite the centrality of violence and military might to the New Order, which has been described as a 'vast machine of state violence', state institutions did not possess a complete monopoly over force (Anderson 2001, 13). This was the 'totalitarian ambition' element the regime aspired to, but could never fully achieve. What was successfully established, and reproduced, was a sufficient concentration of the primary means of violence by which state agencies were able to determine, albeit incompletely, who else could use force and in what circumstances, developing a complex system of subcontracted and state-sanctioned violence and coercion. This entailed an intentional blurring between 'state' and 'criminality' and private and public violence, leading to a situation where a multitude of actors employed violence and coercion under the guise of the state and its symbols. Even if the violence was state sanctioned, it was frequently managed in such a way as to give the impression that it was outside immediate state control.

It was in this respect that the New Order state operated with an operational logic similar to that of the protection racket, legitimating its existence by creating and managing tensions and conflicts that only it was capable of resolving. Ultimately the state and its numerous auxiliaries were the very threat from which it offered protection, the price being loyalty, acquiescence and of course 'tribute'. Some of these threats appeared 'real' and external, such as sectarian violence and secessionist movements in Aceh, East Timor and West Papua, though these were also arguably the product of the state's own methods (Bertrand 2004a). Others were clearly invented, such as the claim repeated ad nauseam of the latent threat of a resurgent PKI, the invisible 'enemy within'. Historically, war making has been an integral element of state making, hence it was necessary that 'enemies of the state' were periodically identified and attacked (Lindsey 2006, 25). As Tilly has stated, to the extent that a government protects its citizens from threats that are either

imaginary or the product of its own activities, it has organised a protection racket (Tilly 1985, 171).

In his succinct summation of the nature of government in the absence of a Hobbesian social contract, Tilly argues that what differentiates the protection racket from the state is that the former operates 'without the sanctity of government' (Tilly 1985, 171). In the New Order, however, this was not entirely the case. The political elite was effectively a structure of rackets that endeavoured to repress the general populace through a combination of threats and enticements. The 'unity' and coherence of the nation-state, like Migdal's ideological 'image' (Migdal 2001, 16), was the sum total of interdependent sets of contingent loyalties that masked tensions, rivalries and an almost total absence of trust, similar to what Horkheimer has described as a 'society of rackets' (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 25–26). Developed to explain the intense rivalry, fragmentation and violence found within fascist regimes, Horkheimer defined the racket as 'a conspiring group who push for their collective interests against the interests of the whole', with the nation as an 'organization that serves the rackets' (Horkheimer, in Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 27). The dominant class according to Horkheimer was 'a structure of rackets based on a definite mode of production, so long as it holds down and protects the lower orders' (Stirk 1992, 143). While in competition with each other over strategic positions within the structure of rackets, this dominant class shared an interest in the suppression of counter-hegemonic forces that may challenge its economic monopolies. Horkheimer uses the concept of the racket rather than the ruling class in order to emphasise the double-edged nature of protection identified by Tilly and the centrality of coercion in repressive regimes, which he considered to be the common denominator of domination. Hence, the defining elements of the racket system were violent coercion and disregard of the individual, corruption (which Horkheimer considered to be the privatisation of power) and a disregard for prescribed notions of law or justice (Stirk 1992, 142). The success of the protection racket regime was dependent upon the management of tensions and rivalries within the dominant class and the incorporation or elimination of potential challengers to its authority.

Through the constant invocation of an imminent threat, a virtual state of fear, the New Order protection racket state was able to justify its extra-legal repression, arbitrary use of force and crippling extraction of rents. The New Order went to great lengths to give the appearance of being strong. Yet despite its 'totalitarian ambition', the infiltration of the military into nearly every aspect of social and political life and a vast bureaucracy and surveillance system, the New Order elite still never fully possessed the monopoly over force it so greatly desired. Nowhere is this more clearly evident than in the relationship with jago, preman, militias and the notion of the 'criminal'. Throughout the 32 years that the New Order held power, Suharto used governmental institutions as political machines, in part as a patrimonial ruler to distribute patronage to brokers and clienteles and in part as an authoritarian ruler to enforce compliance. In this way 'the state' – what Lindsey has

described as 'an elite that was equivalent to the state itself' – operated in a way analogous to the very criminal gangs it routinely employed, its success contingent upon the existence of a strong and powerful 'boss' (Lindsey 2006, 25). From this perspective Suharto was the mafia don par excellence, controlling subordinates through the distribution of patronage and by managing conflicts between them with a unique Machiavellian flair.

The violent strategies by which the state sought to gain and maintain its power and money were both 'lawless' and mysterious, and it was here that the line between 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' violence became permanently obscured. The state claimed a monopoly of legitimacy whilst simultaneously orchestrating threats that appeared to challenge it. It took extreme measures against organised crime, while replicating many of its functions. Monopolisation over violence was a well-managed matter of appearances. In this 'state of insecurity', street thugs, gangsters and other extra-state elements played an integral role both as 'threat' (in a real and symbolic sense) and as a core part of a complex network of power and vested interests that extended from the president down to the neighbourhood level. The delegation of the label of 'criminal' was not prescribed according to breaches of normative law, but in terms of the perceived threat a particular group was considered to pose to state power (Lev 1999). Such 'justice' was also a commodity that could be sold to the highest bidder. This is nowhere more concisely illustrated than in the emergence and gradual shift in the colloquial meaning of the word preman that took place during the New Order. Up until the mid-1980s 'to go preman' referred to a policeman or soldier out of uniform, an officer wearing their civvies. Gradually though it took on connotations of criminality and violence. By the 1990s preman was synonymous with street thugs, gangsters and an extensive network of rackets run by them and in coordination with state actors. As Ryter explained, 'if politicians and soldiers were revealed as essentially preman, so preman were revealed as politicians and soldiers' (Ryter 2005). Towards the end of the New Order this situation reached the extent that 'the thin line between criminals and soldiers (and politicians) seemed to vanish' (Ryter 2005). This reliance upon extra-state elements and the ambiguity between them and state functionaries played a crucial role in the eventual unravelling of the deceptions upon which the New Order's legitimacy was based.

In this chapter it will be argued that the racketeering nature of the New Order was more than mere analogy. It is not the intention of this book to give a comprehensive examination of the phenomenon of crime-state relations during the New Order and the political and economic specifics of the New Order have been described in great detail elsewhere.[1] What the book will do is identify several key dynamics and strategies that characterised the relationship between the New Order state and 'non-state' entrepreneurs in violence. With these in mind, we shall be better equipped to understand the transformation of the protection racket state and the emergent role of violent entrepreneurs that occurred post-1998.

New Order beginnings

Like the republican government of the newly independent Indonesia, the integration and pacification of demobilised youth, civilian vigilantes and jago in the aftermath of the chaotic blood-letting of 1965 presented itself as a particular problem to the new regime.[2] A large part of the killings, which were estimated to have resulted in the deaths of up to 1 million people, were carried out by anti-communist militias, gangsters and vigilantes such as the Ansor youth organisation of the Nahdatul Ulama and Pemuda Pancasila, which were mobilised and given training and logistical support by the military (Fealy and McGregor 2010). It was General Suharto's ability to 'restore order' from the chaos that he had contributed to orchestrating that underpinned the New Order's early claims to legitimacy.[3] During the late 1960s and early 1970s many of the gangs and youth organisations that had been mobilised by the military in 1965 had now returned to their neighbourhoods and a combination of boredom and a lack of work or opportunities meant that many continued with the criminal activities that had sustained them. Like the jago and laskar of the revolution, they had profited handsomely from the disorder by extracting, stealing and appropriating property from 'communists'. In times of upheaval the 'law of the jago' prevailed; however, a new 'order' had now come into effect and different rules applied.

The early 1970s were a period of intense activity as the New Order sought to extend and consolidate its power. The coalition with anti-communist students that had helped bring the New Order into power fractured as they grew increasingly disillusioned with the entrenchment of the military in government. A new formulation of the state was required. Further developing the elements of the corporatist state concept that had been used to legitimise Sukarno's Guided Democracy, Suharto's personal assistant and later Minister for Information General Ali Murtopo masterminded the ideological foundations of the new state as one based upon 'functional groups' (*golongan karya*, or *Golkar*).[4] In this corporatist vision, all segments of society – workers, peasants, civil servants and youth – were united in single 'unitary' representative bodies that were answerable to the state. This system made the identification of 'criminal' and 'subversive' a straightforward matter.

This also extended to gangs, which were reconfigured as 'youth' (*pemuda*). Many of the prominent gangs in Jakarta such as Berlan and the Siliwangi Boys were based in military housing complexes and were made up of the children of military officers (Ryter 1998, 59). Like other elements of society, gangs could not be allowed to continue as autonomous and hence potentially subversive entities. In response to a perceived increase in gang-related violence, in 1972 General Soemitro, the commander of the Command for the Restoration of Security and Public Order (*Komando Pemulihan Keamanan dan Ketertiban*, or *Kopkamtib*), ordered that 'groups and gangs of teenagers' be disbanded (Ryter 1998, 61). As Ryter has argued, the disbandment of gangs was intended not to eliminate crime per se, but to lay the way for

reconstituting and regularising them in a manner that was conducive to strengthening state power. During the 1970s a host of 'youth organisations' emerged throughout the country which provided a new institutionalised framework for jago and gangs. These included, amongst others, the PPM, Siliwangi Youth Generation (*Angkatan Muda Siliwangi*, or AMS), Association of Functional Group Youths (*Ikatan Pemuda Karya*, or IPK), the Forum of the Sons and Daughters of Retired Military (*Forum Komunikasi Putra Putri Indonesia*, or FKPPI) and the Golkar youth organisation Indonesian Youth Renewal Generation (*Angkatan Muda Pembaharuan Indonesia*, or AMPI). All by definition had close links to the military and Golkar both as formal heads and as informal patrons and clients, displaying an often exaggerated ideological affinity with the state including the wearing of garish camouflage fatigues and berets.

Much of the impetus for these new groups came from Murtopo, who as the head of the Special Operations Command (OPSUS) forged close links with numerous gangs and underworld figures.[5] As 'functional groups', Murtopo put his so-called 'zoo' of thugs to work during the elections of 1971 and 1977 in order to ensure that Golkar received its predetermined quota of votes. Known as 'festivals of democracy', the sham elections were characterised by noisy street convoys that often descended into violence.[6] The purpose was to demonstrate the government's ability to control threats posed by this sole state-sanctioned forum for popular participation in politics as well as to intimidate opponents and the voting public into supporting Golkar. The regular campaign violence supported another of Murtopo's concepts, the 'floating mass', whereby in the interests of stability the population was to be estranged from all political activity. In 1974 thugs linked to Murtopo turned peaceful student demonstrations in Jakarta against the visit of the Japanese prime minister into violent riots known as the 'January Disaster' (*Malapetaka Januari* or *Malari*). Murtopo's mobilisation of thugs served a dual political purpose: to justify harsh crackdowns on student activism as well as portray his political rival General Sumitro as being incapable of maintaining order.[7] This pattern, of using thugs as agents provocateurs to discredit and disorganise civil society, became characteristic of the New Order's particular style of divide and rule.

In July of 1973 the Indonesian National Youth Committee (*Komite Nasional Pemuda Indonesia* or KNPI) was formed as the sole forum for youth organisations in Indonesia. A subcommittee of the National Intelligence Agency (*Badan Koordinasi Intelijen Negara* or BAKIN) assembled former gang leaders for training as mechanics. The result was, as Ryter states, the establishment of 'a pattern of access to *preman* followed by other army commanders' (Ryter 1998, 62). Throughout the country local military commanders followed suit and 'began to increase their access to gangs by establishing various Teen Clubs, with an emphasis on sports' (Ryter 1998, 62). The rationale of these groups was almost uniformly the same, to provide 'guidance' (*pembinaan*) to youth and help direct their 'aspirations' towards the twin state

goals of 'unity' (read 'security') and 'development'. The violence and criminality of youth was from this perspective not inherently 'criminal' but was a manifestation of their 'youthful exuberance' (*semangat pemuda*), which had yet to be provided with a suitable channel. To the state this raw *semangat* was a valuable human resource, as had been shown in the killings of 1965–66 and the 1971 elections, and so appropriate institutional structures were needed in order to discipline and utilise it effectively. In this regard the choice of sport was by no means arbitrary. Sport and particularly indigenous Malay martial arts such as pencak silat provided both an ideological and organisational link between the world of gangs and the military.

The connection between sport and militarism has been well documented in numerous places and periods of history (Hargreaves 1982). From the role of martial arts in the ideology of Japanese fascism and militant Hinduism, the semi-criminal *Ringvereine* wrestling associations of nineteenth-century Germany to the strictly controlled state athleticism of West Germany and Soviet Russia, the athlete's body has acted as a convenient symbol of national prowess and state strength.[8] In the case of Suharto's Indonesia, the ascendancy of the New Order via military might, the resulting centralisation of power and corporatisation of civil society needed to be further consolidated by a variety of strategies at the micro-level. Forcibly converting individuals into disciplined citizens has seldom succeeded on its own. In the case of jago, what were required were disciplinary regimes that would further socialise them into the new 'rules of the game', increase their utilitarian value and transform them into 'nationalists'.

'Civilising' violence

The culture and practice of pencak silat had long been an integral aspect of the world of the jago. The informal and charismatic nature of silat schools, the focus upon secrecy and initiation in conjunction with displays of prowess and violent machismo meant in practice that the two were often indistinguishable. Most importantly, pencak silat provided the physical skills necessary for a career in violence. In this respect the New Order's reorganisation of the silat world that began in the 1970s was one part of the broader project to bring entrepreneurs in violence firmly under state control. While volleyball, football, badminton and other competitive sports received attention, it was pencak silat that attracted the greatest interest of the state. In contrast to the largely symbolic value of other sports, pencak silat possessed a distinctly utilitarian importance. In military circles pencak silat was at the philosophical core of Javanese military tradition and as an indigenous Malay martial art, it was 'authentically Indonesian' unlike imports such as karate, qualifying it as part of 'national culture'.

A national pencak silat association (*Ikatan Pencak Silat Indonesia* or IPSI) had already been established in 1948 as part of the efforts of the republican

government to provide an institutional and administrative framework within which to accommodate demobilised laskar and jago.[9] Its bureaucratic and administrative reach, however, had been limited, affiliation was voluntary, and it was in competition with a number of other regionally based silat organisations. At the 1973 IPSI national congress, the first since the coming to power of the New Order, Wongsonegoro, a former minister of internal affairs under Sukarno who had headed IPSI since its inception, was replaced by Tjokropranolo, the governor of Jakarta and a retired brigadier general.[10] Major General Edi Marzuki Nalapraya, who at the time was deputy commander of the Jakarta Regional Military Command (*Kodam Jaya*) and a close family friend of the Suharto, was appointed deputy.[11] This reflected the broader process of the militarisation of social and cultural organisations throughout the country, and the weeding out of suspected leftists and Sukarno loyalists within government. Suharto took a close personal interest in IPSI, and was bestowed with the title of 'prime master' (*pendekar utama*), a figurative 'king of the jago'.[12] With his blessing, IPSI became the sole state-sanctioned body for pencak silat.

In his address at the 1973 IPSI congress, Suharto stated that the time had come for pencak silat practitioners to 'change their primordial, exclusive and ego-centric attitudes for the sake of the success of national pencak silat and national development' (Maryono 1998, 99). Individual and local interests were to be subordinate to those of society as a whole. In the New Order's organicist vision, 'society' and 'state' were an inseparable unity, justifying the intervention of the state and especially the military in all aspects of social, cultural and political life. IPSI's initial 1948 mission statement had emphasised the importance of preserving silat as a 'national cultural heirloom'. Its new objectives were much more decidedly political:

> To guide Indonesian pencak silat practitioners in order that they can make manifest the Archipelago Concept (*Wawasan Nusantara*) as well as participate positively in the implementation of national development, national defence, and the maintenance of national security as an integral part of the implementation of the Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution.
> (PB IPSI 1994)[13]

To facilitate this newly defined role for pencak silat, the 1973 IPSI congress determined that a competitive 'sport' version of pencak silat was now to be the primary vehicle through which it would be organised and practised.[14] A form of pencak silat with the characteristics of Western sport had existed for some time, but was generally considered a dilution of and deviation from traditional pencak silat which, like the New Order, prioritised brutal efficiency in dealing with opponents.[15] Why then should sport be prioritised over the purely martial aspects that held a clear utilitarian value? In order to understand this it is necessary to look at 'sport' from a sociological perspective. According to Norbert Elias, sport 'requires physical exertion of some kind

and is fought out according to known rules, including, where appropriate, rules which define the permitted limits of physical force' (Elias and Dunning 1986, 156). The institutional and regulatory framework of sport provided inherent sets of control mechanisms over how, where and to what extent violence was acceptable.

The introduction of a competitive arena had significant implications for the ways in which the world of jago would be organised. According to one pencak silat teacher, sport pencak silat had an immediate impact upon territorial disputes and turf wars amongst jago as it partially substituted bloody street brawls with a rule-regulated context in which rivalries could be played out in a controlled and monitored environment.[16] A jawara from Bandung recounts how prior to the competitions local jawara would often settle conflicts and create a name for themselves ('*cari nama*') via pre-arranged challenge fights held in a suitably 'spooky' (*angker*) location such as a dark alley. A distinct code of practice was adhered to, largely in order to avoid the interference or unwanted attention of the authorities:

> There was no ganging up or hitting from behind (*main keroyok*) like nowadays but it was a duel to the death. The fights were one-on-one until one party either conceded defeat or didn't get up. *Ilmu* (esoteric knowledge/magic power) played a big part, and we all carried talismans (*jimat*) that had been 'filled' with magical power. If the police showed up we would say that we were just doing silat training, and usually that's all they wanted to know. If they asked more questions we answered them with packets of cigarettes and some cash. We may have been rough around the edges, but we still had ethics, and that's why we got respect.[17]

More commonly, though, disputes were settled and reputations established via far less discreet and messy inter-gang wars, which often verged on street riots, such as in the following testimony:

> At the time the gang from Cimahi attacked our neighbourhood. They were trying to make a name for themselves and take control of our turf. When the trouble started Kang X came out into the streets, not to attack but to try and stop things getting worse by preventing the Cimahi crew from coming into our street. From Cimahi there were…I couldn't count how many as they mixed in with those shopping at the market. This was around 1968/69. Fights started to break out between the Cimahi *crossboy* and locals.[18] Kang X was set upon by a group of the Cimahi gang. At that time I wasn't involved, though I had several machetes with me. I passed them to Kang X who proceeded to use them on his attackers. He did it with such ease and beauty…dak dak dak!! Within moments all of them were taken care of. How did he do it?…I don't really know. It must have been because he had already been on a journey to seek knowledge (*merantau cari ilmu*) and had become a true master of martial arts. I was

> deeply moved. At that moment I knew that I wanted to become his disciple.[19]

Mastery of the new competition format involved regulated military-like training regimes and the inculcation of a 'warrior's code' that mirrored New Order interpretations of the state ideology of Pancasila.[20] 'Cross-training' between pencak silat practitioners and military units became commonplace. The technical rules governing combat forced an altering of techniques aimed at maiming or killing an opponent to mimetic activities that had the abstract aim of accumulating 'points'. Further refining and tightening of the rules and the introduction of body protectors reduced the possibility of injury, placing greater and greater restrictions on physical action. The rule-bound sporting silat altered the jago ethos from one of 'fighting to win' to one of 'playing the game'.[21]

From the perspective of the state, frustrations and rivalries considered potential sources of civil disturbance could now find release in the arena, not in the streets.[22] Formalised hierarchical grading systems were introduced, and in order to enter competitions, schools were required to submit lists of registered members, and restructure in line with a semi-bureaucratic model of organisation determined by IPSI.[23] The lure was the 'prestige' of success, which entailed public accolades and the opportunity to compete at the national and international levels. This also opened up channels of funding and patronage from the military, the Indonesian National Sports Commission (*Komite Olahraga Nasional Indonesia*, or KONI), state-affiliated businesses and the president himself.[24] Suharto regularly rewarded successful pencak silat athletes at the national level with generous cash prizes.

As Elias has argued, the historical emergence of sport as an institution correlates to a reduction and limitation of acceptable levels of violence within society, and as such is an integral aspect of state building (Elias 1995), with sport operating as a substitute for war.[25] In the case of pencak silat, its reinvention at the hands of the military and state officials appeared as part of a larger 'civilising project' by the New Order, which sought to convert excessive and unregulated violence into rule-governed contests of which they were the final arbiter. The symbolic message of sporting pencak silat was that mediated violence was acceptable when it was conducted within state-sanctioned forums and directed towards state-approved goals. In instrumental terms, the reorganisation of pencak silat brought formerly disparate pencak silat groups and jago gangs with a variety of ideological foundations under the mantle of the national silat association led by the president and military figures. Given quasi-military-style instruction and indoctrination in state ideology, silat and jago culture was transformed into a well-disciplined auxiliary for the military, a 'vanguard' of militant nationalism. In this respect 'sport' for the New Order was a means of cultivating the 'human resources' deemed necessary for its corporatist authoritarian vision. Sport produced the disciplined, efficient and compliant bodies needed for transforming youth into loyal subjects. In a

speech to a national workshop on 'the development of sport' in 1973, Suharto outlined his vision for its role in national life:

> Either directly or indirectly, to a greater or lesser degree, the discipline found in sport will foster individual discipline. Individuals who are disciplined, citizens who are disciplined, will develop a disciplined nation. National discipline is essential for the growth of an orderly and dynamic society… Sport contains several elements that are important to national guidance especially in the current development era. One important aspect of sport is the attitude of sportsmanship, the attitude of the *kesatria*. This means that if our opponent is victorious, then we accept this victory with respect.[26]

Institutionalising jago: the Banten Pendekar Association

These institutional formats and disciplinary regimes provided a means whereby jago and youth could be 'civilised' and then utilised towards state-defined goals. Other strategies focused upon the development and consolidation of networks of patronage that sought to integrate more established entrepreneurs in violence within state structures. One example of this was the jawara community of Banten. In 1971 jawara, along with the other traditional 'pillar' of informal leadership in Banten, *ulama* Islamic scholars, were institutionalised via the establishment of 'working units' (*satuan karya* or SatKar). In order to avoid the historical associations with revolt, the PKI and banditry, the term jawara was replaced with *pendekar* that was more explicitly associated with the reinvented culture of pencak silat and the military ideal of the *kesatria* warrior.[27] The stated purpose of the SatKar Pendekar was to 'channel the aspirations of jawara' away from self-interest and criminality towards more 'constructive' activities that contributed to the New Order's programme of social and economic development.[28] The impetus for the Satkar Pendekar came from Tubagus Chasan Sochib, known in Banten as the 'jawara of the jawaras'. Sochib was a former laskar guerrilla fighter who had forged close links with the military, especially the Siliwangi division, for which he provided logistical support in the late 1960s (Masaaki 2004).[29] A dominant figure in Banten society, Sochib was the perfect broker, acting as an intermediary between business, Golkar, the military, and the jawara and criminal underworld of Banten.

This initiative to institutionalise jawara within a single organisation was not uniformly welcomed in Banten.[30] Many jawara groups considered the SatKar as disruptive of their localised monopolies over protection rackets and rent seeking. According to Kasmiri Assabdu, a Banten silat master, the first meetings of the SatKar were a tense affair, and fights between rival jawara were only narrowly avoided. The new political reality, however, was that the success of small jawara groups was contingent upon the support of Golkar and the military, which now necessitated that Banten jawara join the SatKar Pendekar. Ali Murtopo, who reportedly attended the meetings, is said to have

used 'both carrot and stick', making it clear that jawara who remained outside SatKar Pendekar would find it increasingly difficult to operate, but that involvement in the organisation would open up a wealth of new opportunities.[31] 'Mono-loyalty' to the state made perfect sense when fighting on its behalf brought with it material rewards, and already had historical precedence in jawara tradition.

The most immediate reward was the rapid success of Sochib's construction company, PT Sinar Ciomas Raya, which all but monopolised government contracts. Sochib was appointed head of the Banten Regional Chamber of Commerce and Trade and the national executive of the National Construction Contractors Association. He used his position to good effect, putting his jawara on local executive committees and using them as subcontractors on his various construction projects (Masaaki 2004).[32] In return for these concessions the SatKar Pendekar became Golkar loyalists par excellence. Taking full advantage of the long-standing influence of jawara in Banten society, they regularly exerted muscle on behalf of their patron, intimidating the population, student activists and rival parties to ensure that Golkar won landslide electoral victories in the region.[33] SatKar jawara were granted exemption from criminal law that prohibited the carrying of sharp weapons in order to preserve the 'jawara tradition' of bearing a machete. As Tadjus Sobirin, the Jakarta chairman of Golkar, stated, 'If a cowboy doesn't carry a pistol, he's no cowboy. If a pendekar doesn't carry a machete then he's no pendekar!'[34]

In line with this culturalist rationale for violence, in 1974 SatKar Pendekar changed its name to the less utilitarian sounding Indonesian Association of Bantenese Silat and Culture (*Persatuan Persilatan dan Seni Budaya Banten Indonesia*, or PPSBBI), presenting itself as an ostensibly more benign and less politically partisan 'cultural forum' for jawara and Banten silat schools throughout the country. The name change was accompanied by a drive to extend Sochib's domain beyond Banten, and integrate more geographically dispersed silat-based jawara groups and *debus* invulnerability fraternities that operated outside the SatKar Pendekar, such as those based in nearby Tangerang, Jakarta's port town of Tanjung Priok and Lampung in south Sumatra.[35] In the words of Sochib, 'in the past jawara only fought for themselves, their group or tribe, however via the PPSBBI together we fight for the nation and the state'.[36]

The spectre of crime

While the institutionalisation of jago and jawara through vehicles such as the PPSBBI created operational and material links binding entrepreneurs in violence to the state, a combination of other social, economic and political forces were also at play which led to the emergence of more autonomous constellations of informal power and the re-emergence of 'crime' as an issue of public concern. After the economic boom of the 1970s, global economic recession forced the New Order to withdraw subsidies on basic goods, a decision that

increased the hardship of the urban poor. The currency underwent a drastic devaluation and social unrest followed, with a rise in industrial action, student activism and anti-Chinese rioting. Construction and other development projects that had boomed during the 1970s decreased, reducing the opportunities for jago and gangs that had grown in its wake, making a living from semi-legal work as subcontractors or operating protection rackets. While overall crime rates remained stable, violent crime such as armed robberies increased.[37] Cribb suggests that the upsurge in violent crime was the product of a combination of economic downturn coupled with the lack of work faced by gangs employed during the 1982 elections to ensure Golkar's success (Cribb 2003). In the elections of 1971 and 1977 gangs had performed a similar role, but this time the post-election slump coincided with an economic one. As a result, jago increasingly resorted to crimes such as armed robbery on public transport, which were outside accepted modes of criminality such as racketeering. Tensions within the political elites were also high. Suharto had grown increasingly uneasy at the extent and strength of Murtopo's gangster menagerie coupled with rumours of his desire for the presidency, and began grooming the hardliner General Benny Moerdani as his replacement.

Extensive and sensationalist coverage in the popular media fed public perceptions that an unprecedented wave of brutal and indiscriminate violent crime, labelled *kriminalitas*, by 'gangs of wild youth' (*gabungan anak liar*, or *gali*) was spiralling out of control.[38] Reports highlighted the sadistic and cruel nature of the robbers; these were desperate men not bound by conventional norms and morals or the 'code of honour' of the jago. Economic decline coupled with a growing climate of fear. State repression had always been rationalised as a necessary price to pay for economic development and modernisation (Cribb 2003, 188). If violent crime was the product of poverty as was the general perception, and the state was incapable of stemming either, then the twin foundations of New Order legitimacy appeared hollow. This was exacerbated by the common view that the police were both endemically corrupt and hopelessly inefficient.[39] The situation necessitated a decisive response. In August 1982 a significant shift occurred in the focus of the government's security policy away from the political threat claimed to be posed by remnants of the PKI and towards the danger to the state posed by the by-products of economic recession: poverty, crime and, in the words of Kopkamtib commander Admiral Sudomo, 'too many people' (Kroef 1984, 747). The policy change produced two radically different strategies, one legal-institutional, the other extra-judicial. The combined effect of both would result in a comprehensive restructuring of informal security, a re-categorisation of the 'criminal' and a retightening of state control.

Integrate: the environment security system

During the late 1970s some of the more established gangs had become more entrepreneurial and professional, expanding private security services to the

extent that they began to be considered a challenge to the authority of the police (Barker 1998). Local gangs remained focused on maintaining control of their generally limited turf, whereas the entrepreneurial groups offered a range of protection services, including bodyguards and security for businesses, shops and transport companies (Barker 1998, 12). With memberships often in the tens of thousands, these groups were in transition from loosely structured charismatic-based groups to semi-professional bureaucratic organisations with a network of patronage and clientele that by-passed state authorities and extended beyond their immediate 'turf'. The industrialisation and rapid economic growth of the 1970s had resulted in commercial activity and commercial spaces such as factories and shopping complexes as well as penetration in the cash economy. This had opened up a wealth of opportunities for racketeering and security services. In some areas the role of these groups in day-to-day law enforcement was greater than that of the police.[40] A private security-business nexus that circumvented state control was unacceptable as it challenged monopoly claims over security and opportunities for illegal rents (*setoran*). The fear that emerged in the minds of the military and police was the possibility that these gangs and entrepreneurs in protection could coalesce into broader structural rackets like the Sicilian Mafia or the Yakuza in Japan.[41]

In response, the chief of police, Awaloedin Djamin, devised an extensive territorial surveillance structure known as the 'environment security system' (*sistem keamanan lingkungan*, or *Siskamling*), which aimed to bring these groups back under police control. The *siskamling* was based upon a territorial system similar to that used by the military whereby networks of local security posts manned by a combination of local residents and registered security guards under the direction of the police were responsible for maintaining local security. Known as *pos kamling* the posts were subject to inventory, classification and regular inspection by the police. In order to re-monopolise control over the role of protection, territory needed to be broken down into smaller observable units (Barker 1998, 14). The *siskamling* system created a new official role for local gangs, many of which were recruited into three new types of official security guards. Civil security guards (*Pertahanan Sipil* or *Hansip*) and night patrols (*ronda malam*) were designated responsibility for neighbourhood security, while 'security guards' (*Satuan Pengamanan* or *Satpam*) had the task of guarding businesses, bus stations and public places. Coordinated by a specially created police division known as 'Society Guidance' (*Bimbingan Masyarakat* or *Bimmas*), all Hansip and Satpam were required to participate in regular training courses, after which they were given a licence and a uniform.

Insofar as gangs and private security entrepreneurs were the object of *siskamling*, they were also the logical choice for recruits. In the words of Barker, 'both gangs and neighborhood watches were extremely effective tools for day-to-day surveillance of the population, and siskamling provided a rubric for integrating them into the bureaucratic surveillance machine' (Barker 1998,

13). However, the siskamling contained a number of significant flaws that undermined its objectives. Hansip and Satpam were not funded by government, and hence depended upon the community or businesses they protected for their income. This resulted in a continuation of patterns of extortion and racketeering which were strengthened by the provision of rudimentary training, uniforms and official titles. In practice, police control over Hansip and Satpam was limited and further compromised by corruption. Often the only real difference in practice between the guards and pre-existing gangs was that one now wore a uniform and had the official backing of the authorities while the other ostensibly did not.[42] In many instances the individuals and roles were interchangeable. The attempt to make instrumental use of gangs may have strengthened state monopolisation but it simultaneously further compromised what remained of the institutional integrity and legitimacy of the police. The police were 'criminalised' while gangsters were 'militarised'.

If local communities benefited little from siskamling, from the perspective of state authorities the system served the purpose of superficially 'eliminating crime' by appropriating its sources at the local level and integrating them within the organs of the state. In this way the state acted as a franchise. It redrew lines of territorial control and in doing so also reconfigured the discursive boundaries defining 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' sources of protection. Those that continued to operate outside this system without the protection of a powerful patron or a state-sanctioned youth organisation such as Pemuda Pancasila, were consequently easily identified as 'criminal', preparing the way for brutal elimination.

Eliminate: 'mysterious shootings'

According to Bourchier, despite the expansion of siskamling, tensions continued within the military and police over how best to deal with the 'crime problem' and the challenges it was believed to pose to the New Order's legitimacy (Bourchier 1994, 183). Awaloeddin Djamin argued that crime was an inevitable outcome of broader social problems such as unemployment and poverty brought about by modernisation, and consequently it was manageable through existing legal channels and the further strengthening of programmes such as the siskamling.[43] Others within the military, such as Suharto confidant Edi Nalapraya along with Lt. General Ismail, disagreed, asserting that current measures had failed. The *kriminal* was a 'morality-free criminal' and hence beyond recuperation or the lure of material enticement (Bertrand 2004b, 325). This type of criminal was clearly a threat to national stability and hence an infinitely harsher military-style approach was required. Suharto effectively ended the debate when he appointed Benny Moerdani, a renowned hardliner, as head of Kopkamtib and removed several reform-minded generals (Bourchier 1994, 183).

Starting in March 1983 in Yogyakarta, the bodies of known petty criminals and ex-cons began to appear on the streets. These killings continued until

1985, and it is estimated that anywhere from 5,000 to 10,000 suspected gali were killed. The largest concentrations were in Yogyakarta, East Java and Jakarta.[44] Most of the victims were ex-cons, petty criminals or gang members, others simply unemployed youth or plainly unlucky. The police are said to have submitted lists of local recidivists to the military, which used them to compile hit lists (Kroef 1984). Tattoos in particular, considered a symbolic mark of identification with the criminal underworld, were used to identify potential targets for elimination (Barker 1998, 26).[45] The summary executions were carried out by hit squads driving unmarked vehicles and the intention was clearly to terrorise. The manner of their execution was consistently extreme, and in many cases the bodies were riddled with hundreds of bullets and showed obvious signs of torture. Killings were often performed in public places and the victims' bodies were left in full view. As one witness recounted, 'In one instance six men, clearly military, dragged a suspect to a garbage dump, drew knives, and methodically stabbed him to death while hundreds of people watched from the road above' (quoted in Kroef 1984, 748).

Few had any doubts that the military was carrying out the killings. The manner in which they were conducted was brutally efficient and clearly well coordinated. Yet the state authorities were reluctant to concede responsibility publicly. Moerdani suggested that the corpses routinely appearing in the streets throughout the country were the product of turf wars amongst gali themselves.[46] The ambiguity arising from the unwillingness of the state to explain exactly who was behind the killings led to them being dubbed by the press as the 'mysterious shootings' (*penembakan misterius*, or *Petrus*). Initial public support for the killings also took pressure off the government to admit culpability openly, while protecting itself from the condemnation of domestic and foreign NGOs and human rights groups. Violent crime rates decreased, and those who had been its target had few complaints, even if the measures taken to achieve it were extreme. The killings only began to decrease after increasing reports of cases of extortion and killings clearly motivated by political and personal reasons coupled with a growing sympathy for the victims and their families led to a gradual wane in public support and a sense that the campaign had now 'gone too far' (Bourchier 1994, 191).

The brutality and lawlessness attributed to gali by the media was matched and transcended by the state. Being a gali, or even being suspected of being one, warranted death, and the identity of a gali was determined not by law but by the state and its anonymous lists. It is here, as Siegel has argued, that the state appropriated the power that it had ascribed to the gali (Siegel 1998, 228). The use of tattoos as an identifier of *kriminalitas* underscores the symbolic and performative nature of the killings. Whether the nameless victims were actually involved in violent crime or not appears secondary in importance to the fact that their tattooed corpses signified the presence of criminality. So many tattooed corpses littering the streets served as 'proof' of the dangers from which the state claimed to be protecting Indonesian society – dangers that only it could overcome by resorting to measures unhampered by

law. The objective of the Petrus operation was also decidedly pragmatic: to break up the entrenchment of gali networks and private security businesses, terrorise into submission gangs not integrated by siskamling, undermine the power base of potential challengers to Suharto's authority such as Ali Murtopo, and also take out at least a few genuine violent criminals.[47] As Suharto was later to admit in his 1989 biography, the purpose of Petrus was 'shock therapy' (Dwipayana and Ramadhan 1989, 389). In this respect it succeeded, not only in relation to gali but society as a whole, demonstrating the capacity and willingness of the state physically to eliminate any challenge to its authority. The combined effect of the introduction of the siskamling system together with Petrus was to 'de-territorialise' local constellations of power and security in order to re-territorialise them in a manner that was conducive to the interests of centralised state power (Barker 1998, 2). Despite the radically different approaches of siskamling and Petrus in tackling the problem of 'crime', both operated from a similar logic of power which had as its objective a radical restructuring of local security.

A new arrangement: beking

The Petrus operation showed that like the jago of the colonial period, urban racketeers and gangsters were situated in a position that was strategic yet precarious. One of the key lessons 'taught' to gangs by Petrus was that no matter how great their local reputation, their power and existence ultimately depended upon the backing of political networks affiliated with not just 'the state', but Suharto. To operate individually or in small gangs without adequate patronage left one perilously vulnerable. Patronage too was fraught with danger, as members of Murtopo's 'zoo' had discovered. At the same time, the ability of preman to control their territory and the economic activity that took place in it made them indispensable. The local preman was in this respect a microcosm of the state, which helps to explain why the emergence of autonomous entrepreneurs in violence in the late 1970s was something that Suharto could not allow. The key to survival for preman was organisation and proclamations of unfaltering loyalty to Golkar, the military and the president. Larger organisations with a national reach such as the Pemuda Pancasila had survived the Petrus period largely unscathed.[48] With their characteristic orange and black camouflage uniforms the Pemuda Pancasila and groups like it displayed an unmistakable identification and affiliation with the very forces that had the power to curtail them (Ryter 1998, 51). As Ryter has argued, the Pemuda Pancasila successfully translated the logic of the jago into a modern organisational format. The weakness of the jago was that their 'personality is unmistakable' (Ryter 1998, 67). This new mode of a hierarchical and franchised system of jago cells brought to local preman the benefits of anonymity within a national organisation. The Pemuda Pancasila were unmistakable in their uniforms, yet were also anonymous as individuals within the context of a mass organisation. A distancing mechanism was

created whereby the actions and excesses of individuals could be disavowed as the work of *oknum* ('rogue individuals'). Like the state, the ideals of the organisation remained untainted even if the actions of its members frequently transgressed them. These 'ideals' of course included providing a material livelihood and 'moral guidance' to its members. The success of this model saw it replicated and copied by numerous other groups throughout the country to the extent that by the mid-1990s most preman were attached to some type of 'youth' organisation.

Hierarchical organisational structures provided the opportunity for advancement. Street-level preman could and frequently did make the transition from thug, to youth organisation functionary, to government bureaucrat and politician. 'Crime' was a means to power, as long as it was through the established channels. For the state the migration of preman into military-linked organisations continued and consolidated the process of corporatisation and institutionalisation that had been started in the early 1970s. The post-Petrus relationship between preman and the state has been frequently expressed as one of *beking* ('backing'), a system of informal patronage whereby preman received protection from the military and police in return for a portion of the profits derived from racketeering, smuggling, gambling, prostitution and other predatory behaviour, along with a willingness to be used for 'regime maintenance chores' such as the harassment of activists and holding 'spontaneous' pro-government demonstrations (Lindsey 2001). The meagre budget of the military meant they came to depend upon the revenue drawn from these arrangements, creating a symbiotic bond.

Beking practices had the effect of increasing the overall cost of doing business, though this was offset by the ability of groups such as the Pemuda Pancasila to keep labour costs to a bare minimum.[49] This also served a political utility as it was in the financial interests of preman to stamp out any union activity or labour activism that could challenge monopolisation; through beking the material interests of preman intersected with the political imperatives of the military to maintain 'order'. The sectoral domination of a group often translated into formal appointments within the bureaucracy. The head of Pemuda Pancasila, Yapto Soerjosoemarno, served as Jakarta head of the state-sanctioned SPSI (*Serikat Pekerja Seluruh Indonesia*, or All Indonesia Workers Union), reproducing a long tradition of preman as labour 'managers', as well as head of the Jakarta Tourist Industry Association (Ryter 1998, 69).[50] Harianto Badjoeri of the PPM held positions within the Ministry for Tourism, before being transferred to the Office for Public Order, the main tasks of which included the eviction of squatters and 'supervision' of street vendors and public transport.

Groups such as the PP, PPM and FKPPI were frequently contracted to intimidate and attack opponents and critics of the government.[51] The surplus of unskilled labour meant that established preman groups could quickly and economically recruit hundreds of petty thugs and unemployed youth in 'defence of the state', avoiding any potentially damaging publicity arising

from clashes between the military and civilians. Always on the lookout for opportunities to make themselves useful, local unaffiliated preman could also be mobilised such as in the following account of an attack on a house occupied by activists from the People's Democratic Party (*Partai Rakyat Demokratik*, or PRD) and the Indonesian Students' Solidarity for Democracy (*Solidaritas mahasiswa Indonesia untuk Demokrasi*, or SMID) in Yogyarkarta, 1996:

> The Siskamling post at the entrance to our kampung was a hang out spot for about half a dozen preman. They would spend most of the day drinking *arak* [rice wine] and apparently 'keeping an eye on things'. Most had spent at least a few years in prison, and were covered in homemade tattoos. They claimed to be Hansip guards, but I never saw any of them wearing the uniform. They made a habit of hitting me up for cigarettes and spare change whenever I would pass by and we suspected that they were responsible for stealing clothes hung out to dry. Apart from that they were friendly enough and helped me a few times to fix my motorbike. This soon changed. Two days after the violence at the PDI headquarters in Jakarta, Suharto appeared on TV to denounce the PRD and SMID as 'communist devils' and blame them for instigating the trouble. The next day I came home to find our friendly neighbourhood preman throwing rocks at our house and shouting out 'we will finish you off… fucking commies!!' and the like. Fortunately Pak X had warned me just as I entered our street that there was trouble so I was able to slip away without being noticed. Most of my housemates had also got word and managed to escape out the back window. Neighbours recounted that they had seen someone identified as an *intel* undercover intelligence agent talking to the preman several days earlier, and that he had handed them a wad of cash.[52]

This particular incident was an offshoot of a larger mobilisation of preman and organised thugs in Jakarta, one that was to have a further unravelling effect upon the public's already frayed image of the regime. In 1996 Megawati had won a second term as head of the PDI over the New Order's preferred candidate, Soerjadi. Megawati's popularity troubled Suharto. Despite her largely uneventful stint in parliament, the symbolism of the Sukarno name and her hint that she might run as a presidential candidate in 1998 constituted a potential threat that needed to be removed. On Suharto's order, a counter-congress was held in Medan in June 1996 in which Soerjadi was appointed head of the party. The Megawati faction refused to recognise the sham congress as legal, and a standoff ensued. Megawati supporters plus an assortment of sympathisers occupied the PDI headquarters in Menteng, central Jakarta, and waited for the inevitable state response.[53]

On 27 July several hundred ostensive 'supporters' of Soerjadi, many dressed in red shirts of the PDI, launched an attack on the Jln. Diponegoro headquarters. The attack was orchestrated by elements of the New Order to give

the appearance of a showdown between supporters of the rival PDI camps, although this was sloppily undermined by the presence of large numbers of troops and police, some of whom are said to have joined in the assault (Eklof 1999, 45). In its aftermath five were left dead and dozens missing, provoking what was then the worst rioting of Suharto's presidency. The PP, as the 'familiar suspect', was initially reported as being involved, but the short hair of some of the attackers led others to speculate it was military 'going preman' (Ryter 1998, 68).[54]

The ramifications of the event and the damage it caused to the New Order's image were immense. Megawati was transformed into a martyr, and her breakaway faction, the PDI-P, quickly developed a mass following (Vickers 2005, 202). Predictably, the incident was used as a justification for a fresh wave of crackdowns on activist and regime critics, Suharto re-invoking the spectre of communism.[55] However, the momentum was now moving in ways the New Order could not control. Media and internet forums filled with speculation: were the attackers' military out-of-uniform, hired thugs acting on behalf of the military or hired military and thugs working for Soerjadi?[56] Specific details aside, the rumours of manipulation, intrigue and conspiracy surrounding the 27 July affair highlighted the end result of beking: the almost complete blurring of the line between, as the news weekly *Tiras* stated, 'preman and preman'.[57] The 'double meaning' of preman collapsed: preman and the state appeared as one and the same. Occurring only several months before the 1997 economic crisis, the 27 July affair played an instrumental role in the unravelling that would culminate in the violent collapse of the New Order in May 1998.

Later in May 1997 a 'former preman', Seno Bella Eymus, filed a suit on his own behalf and that of 49 others, against Soerjadi and four PDI officials, claiming they had not been paid a promised Rp.200 million for storming the PDI headquarters.[58] The absurdity of a preman claiming compensation for a 'contractual breach' over an illegal attack that according to the government's official version, was provoked by an internal party dispute combined with communist agitators, apparently escaped the central Jakarta court which accepted the suit (Eklof 1999, 47). Bella, who was represented in court by Megawati's chief lawyer, lost the case, but only due to 'lack of evidence' that he had entered into a legally binding agreement with Soerjadi.[59] That the attack resulted in deaths, destruction of property and rioting was not a concern of the court, only the 'legality' of a beking arrangement that already by definition operated outside of the law.

Conclusions

The New Order state functioned as the hub for a complex patron-client network, distributing and regulating patronage to clients in return for their political support and facilitation of interests of regime elites, while eliminating or criminalising those who operated outside it: a protection racket regime.

Access to resources thus depended significantly upon personalised relationships through which 'clients' could hope to gain access to material resources in return for their loyalty to individual patrons linked to the various arms and levels of the state, who could then employ this to their advantage in inter-elite rivalries. The fact that beking was dependent upon a personalistic and patrimonial system meant that the resultant distribution of resources was never effectively institutionalised, allowing the incubation of intense rivalries and tensions, a structure of rackets. As middle men, agents provocateurs for hire and state auxiliaries, preman formed part of a parallel, subcontracted system of taxation, violence and social control. The state franchised itself, violent entrepreneurs acting on its behalf, either as a 'spontaneous' defender or a covert agent. The reliance of the New Order upon these extra-state elements in the maintenance of power, whose 'loyalty' was contingent upon material rewards and concessions, created a system that consequently rested upon an inherently unstable basis, what Lindsey has called an 'insecurity state' (Lindsey 2001, 288) and similar to the 'structure of rackets' that Horkheimer argued is an integral feature of totalitarian regimes (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 27).

Nevertheless, it retained durability and certain predictability so long as the military functioned as the focal source of patronage, coercion and 'protection' with Suharto as 'king of the jago'. This powerful centre prevented the emergence of autonomous local strongmen of the kind that emerged in Thailand and the Philippines, as Suharto encouraged rivalries and tensions over the allocation of surplus value and access to parasitical rent extraction (Heryanto and Hadiz 2005). However, as the regime began to fracture in the late 1990s, patronage, racketeering and contracting patterns also begin to splinter, grow more self-sufficient and take on new ideological garb in an attempt to create non-Suharto-dependent modes of legitimation. The New Order's relationship with entrepreneurs in violence rested upon three central strategies: integration into state-created institutions; elimination via purges; and creating dependency based upon contingent patronage. It systematically sought to disorganise civil society and disrupt counter-hegemonic or progressive social forces using elements of this 'uncivil society' over which it attempted to centralise control. In doing so, the state set a model for the contracting of private violence and informal authority which was to have significant consequences for post-New Order Indonesia as both new and old political players continued to use these same strategies, but in a social and political context where the rules, and those able to set and enforce them, had changed.

Notes

1 For an overview of debates on the political nature of the New Order, see Hadiz and Robison 2004, Barker and Klinken 2009, 17–46, and Anderson 1983.
2 A similar relationship of expediency between gangsters and government emerged in Sicily in post-World War II, where the ruling Christian Democrats hired the services of the Mafia to kill communists and peasant and union activists in return for lucrative government contracts. See Blok 1988.

3 The horrific testimonies of some Pemuda Pancasila members regarding their active role in the killings in Medan are documented in the film, *The Act of Killing*.
4 This was also the name of the ruling party, Golkar.
5 To the extent that AMPI was commonly referred to as *Ali Murtopo Presiden Indonesia*, Ali Murtopo, President of Indonesia.
6 The forced merger of opposition parties in 1973 into two state-sanctioned parties, the Indonesian Democratic Party (*Partai Demokrasi Indonesia*, or PDI) and United Development Party (*Partai Persatuan Pembangunan*, or PPP) along with a proportional system in which the military was guaranteed a percentage of seats, meant in practice that Golkar could not lose an election.
7 In 1978 the 'normalisation of campus life' policy was introduced, which effectively outlawed all forms of political activity at universities.
8 See for example, Alter 1994, Abe, Kiyohara and Nakajima 1992, and Hartmann and von Lampe 2008.
9 The first attempt to organise and standardise pencak silat across the archipelago had been carried out by the occupying Japanese in the 1940s. A 'pan-Indonesian' style was formulated and incorporated into the paramilitary drills of the Japanese-led Vanguard Corps militia (*Barisan Pelopor*). What was significant about the endeavour was the initial establishment of a close ideological link between pencak silat, nationalism and militant patriotism.
10 In the 1930s Wongsonegoro had been chairperson of the Surakarta branch of the nationalist organisation Budi Oetomo, and was one of the founders of the Greater Indonesia Party (*Partai Indonesia Raya*). In 1945 he became governor of Central Java, and in 1949 was appointed by Sukarno as the Indonesian minister of internal affairs.
11 Suharto was given the title of 'prime patron' of IPSI and regularly attended its meetings and functions. His son Bambang Trihatmojo was the head of the *Tenaga Dasar* silat school and also on the advisory board of ISPI along with the Faisal Bakri. Nalapraya had previously been head of Suharto's personal bodyguard detail since 1966 before spending two years at Fort Leavenworth in the USA.
12 *Pendekar* is an honorary title bestowed upon those considered to be a master of *pencak silat*.
13 Wawasan Nusantara was a central pillar of New Order ideology, which considered all of the islands and seas making up Indonesia to be an indivisible unity.
14 The Indonesian term used for contemporary sport, *olahraga*, is a composite of the words *olah* and *raga*. *Olah* has the meaning of both 'manner, way of doing things' and 'process', to turn something into something better. *Raga* refers to the physical body. To *olah raga* is literally to 'process the body', transforming it from its base physicality into something 'higher'.
15 Silat axioms such as the Sundanese *teu numpangkeun rasa*, 'eliminate all compassion' and the Betawi *loe jual gue beli*, 'if you are selling, I will buy', highlight the 'win at all costs' philosophy integral to traditional silat practice.
16 Interview with Mochtar Saleh, Bandung, 1999. The socialisation of the competitive format took some time, and early competitions were bloody affairs which often ended with mass brawls between rival schools.
17 Confidential interview, Bandung, 1999.
18 The term *crossboy* originated in the 1950s, referring to fans of James Dean and Elvis Presley. During the 1960s and 1970s it became synonymous with troublesome youths and petty criminals (Ryter 1998, 59).
19 Confidential interview, Bandung, 1999. Another witness to the attack said the Cimahi gang were the children of military and that was why they had the nerve to attack an area well known for its jawara. Further retaliation was only avoided after the intervention of Kang X's uncle, a former colonel in the West Java-based Siliwangi division.

20 The silat pledge reads as follows: 1 We Indonesian *pesilat* are citizens who are devoted to Almighty God and are of noble character. 2 We Indonesian *pesilat* are citizens who defend and put into practice the Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution. 3 We Indonesian *pesilat* are warriors who love the Indonesian nation and homeland. 4 We Indonesian *pesilat* are warriors who hold in high esteem the brotherhood and unity of the nation. 5 We Indonesian *pesilat* are warriors who always pursue progress and are of Indonesian character. 6 We Indonesian *pesilat* are warriors who always maintain truth, honesty and justice. 7 We Indonesian *pesilat* are knights who withstand trials and temptations. The pledge has close parallels with the Seven Articles oath (*Sapta Marga*) of the Indonesian armed forces.

21 As one silat fighter commented, 'The basic idea [of competition] was good; however, many authentic silat fighters consider it an insult, fighting, but so many rules! Fighting is fighting, there is no need for lots of regulations. The one who is cleverest will win, the one who is most powerful will come out on top…with competition that's not the case. You can be the better fighter but still lose to the rules [*kalah aturan*]'. Confidential interview, Bandung, 1999.

22 One silat school in West Java, for example, required as part of its examinations that a pupil must 'take out' a known thug in unarmed combat. The practice was halted in 1983 when concerns grew that it could become confused with the Petrus killings detailed later in the chapter. Confidential interview, Bandung, 1999.

23 This structure required purely administrative positions such as general secretary, accountant and public relations officer. The grading system copied the belt system found in Japanese martial arts.

24 The Bimantara Group of Suharto's son Bambang Trihatmojo, as well as the Bakrie Group, were significant financial backers of IPSI. Trihatmojo was head of the 'Basic Power' (*Tenaga Dasar) pencak silat* school, and provided office space for IPSI functionaries in his corporate headquarters.

25 An argument most convincingly put forward by contributors in Mangan 2003.

26 It is significant that Suharto conflated 'sportsmanship' with the notion of the *kesatria* warrior or knight which was integral to military ideology and identity. The connotation was less one of 'playing fair' as one of being loyal to one's superiors.

27 *Kompas* (1999) 'Orang Banten itu Keras…', 5 July. The word *pendekar* is normatively understood as referring to a master of martial arts, and is said to derive from the base word *dekar*, meaning to fight with a sword. Colloquially it is interpreted as meaning 'short and tough' (*pendek dan kakar*).

28 *Kompas* (1999) 'Persilatan Banten Saat Ini…', 9 November.

29 Sochib was chair of the Banten Veterans of 1945 Association, as well as the founder of the Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University in Banten.

30 Interview with Kasmiri Assabdu, Serang, 1999.

31 Ibid.

32 The SatKar Pendekar came to be known locally as the 'development jawara' (*jawara pembangunan*) – a play on the dual meaning of 'development' as both 'building up' and 'construction', a reference to their monopoly over construction in Banten. According to Bourchier, Murtopo used other Golkar-affiliated associations such as AMPI, KNPI and AMS for the same purposes (Bourchier 1994, 193).

33 Interview with Kasmiri Assabdu, Serang, 1999. Sochib's dominance of Banten political life has continued into the present, his daughter Ratu Atut Chosiyah serving as vice-governor and governor since Banten became a province in 2001.

34 *Aksi* (1999) 'Tadjus Sobirin: "bawa golok wajar saja"', vol. 3, no. 147.

35 Areas such as Tanjung Priok and north Jakarta have long been home to large numbers of migrants from Banten who have moved to the capital to seek a respite from poor economic conditions.

36 *Kompas* (1999), 'Persilatan Banten saat ini…', 9 November.

37 Violent robberies rose from 3.55% of reported crimes in 1980 to 7.41% in 1981 (Bourchier 1994, 179).
38 The tone of reports is best exemplified by those in the populist *Pos Kota* which have been analysed in depth by Siegel (1998), but also included well-respected news journals such as *Tempo*, which started a regular *kriminalitas* section. See for example the cartoon and reports in *Tempo*, 3 April 1982.
39 A survey conducted by *Tempo* in 1982 regarding the public's perception of the police showed that 55.3% of respondents believed that the police were incapable of handling crimes reported to them, while 46.7% considered the police to be rude and aggressive. *Tempo* (1984),'Memeriksa "Potret" Polisi', 7 July.
40 In part this was due to the perception that the police were more expensive and less efficient in handling security than the gangs.
41 *Tempo* (1982) 'Belum sampai tingkat mafia', 3 April.
42 Confidential interview with community leader, Bandung, 1999.
43 *Tempo* (1982) 'Belum sampai tingkat mafia', 3 April.
44 Public opposition to the killings was at best muted, in part due to the complicit role played by the media in sensationalising *gali* violence and in the process dehumanising them. Notable exceptions included Adnan Buyung Nasution of the Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation, and the deputy head of the Supreme Court, Poerwoto Soehardi Gandasubrata.
45 This prompted many to remove their tattoos, either at clinics or by scrubbing their arms with battery acid.
46 *Tempo* (1983) 'Menuju hari-hari tanpa gali', 28 May.
47 Siegel (1998) suggests that the refusal of the military immediately to claim responsibility for the killings renders explanations focused upon pragmatic politics and elite rivalries insufficient. Petrus had a powerful symbolic impact; however, this does not explain away the structural realignment of state-gangster relations that it heralded. The riots at Golkar rallies in Lapangan Banteng in March 1982, several months prior to the start of Petrus in which Murtopo's AMPI was targeted, can be seen as a sign that Suharto had decided to counter the threat to his power that he believed was posed by Murtopo's gangster networks. See *Tempo* (1982) 'Buntut "Banteng" jadi panjang', 3 April.
48 Yapto Soerjosoemarno, the head of Pemuda Pancasila, had family links to Suharto. The rise of the PP in the early 1980s was in all likelihood a Suharto-backed counter to AMPI and Ali Murtopo's *gali* networks.
49 One business owner stated that 'rents' to *preman* and their backers could add up to 20% of total costs. Confidential interview, Bandung, 1999.
50 This was due to the PP's virtual monopoly over security at nightclubs, bars and billiards halls.
51 A typical 'contract' involved the provision of food, drink, transport, logistical support (i.e. walkie talkies or mobile phones) as well as 'cigarette money', the amount of which was dependent upon the nature of the action, going rates and the generosity of the financial backer. In the case of demonstrations, banners and placards were generally provided. Confidential interviews, Jakarta and Bandung, 1999.
52 Author's diary, Yogyakarta, July 1996. It was later revealed that the owner of the local fried rice stall was an ex-army officer who had informed the police that he suspected the house was a 'communist nest' (*sarang komunis*) after overhearing a discussion over dinner two weeks prior to the 27 July affair. The PRD publicly declared itself on 22 July 1996, five days before the attack on the PDI headquarters. On the history of the PRD during this period see Miftahuddin 2004.
53 Initially Megawati was given permission by Major General Sutiyoso for her supporters to occupy the building on the condition that they did not mobilise on the streets. The emergence of 'democracy forums' at the headquarters, where a variety

of pro-democracy activists criticised the New Order, was later cited by Suharto as proof that communist agitators were behind the violence and subsequent rioting. Along with other pro-democracy groups, the PRD saw the PDI standoff as a potential coalescing point for opposition to the New Order.

54 A former member of *Prems* who now heads a Jakarta-based militia group linked to the military, claims that he along with the PP was ordered by Sutiyoso to take part in the attack. Confidential interview, Jakarta, 2007.

55 The most extreme measure of this crackdown was the abduction and torture of PRD, SMID and other activists by the military, some allegedly under the command of Prabowo Subianto, for which he was discharged from the military in 1998.

56 This is drawn from observation of numerous public internet forums and online activist communities in the months preceding the 27 July attack. See also the various accounts in Ajidarma, Saptono and Suwarso 1997.

57 This was also reflected in the 1997 election, in which votes for the PDI dropped from 15% in 1992 down to 3%. Former President Abdurahman Wahid, amongst others, alleged that General Faisal Tanjung and Major-General Syarwan Hamid were involved in orchestrating the attack. See *Jakarta Post* (2000) 'Feisal Tanjung blamed for attack on PDI office', 9 February. Jakarta's military Commander Sutiyoso was appointed governor of Jakarta in 1997, leading to speculation that this was a 'reward' for his role in the incident (Bertrand 2010).

58 Bella was the head of Yayasan At-Taubah, a group for 'reformed' preman. See *Tempo* (1997) 'Wawancara Seno Bella Emyus: saya ditekan untuk menyerbu kantor PDI Megawati', 31 May.

59 The court did accept Bella's claim that he had been hired by Soerjadi to carry out the attack.

4 The changing of the *preman* guard

As we have seen in the previous chapter, the New Order operated in a manner that was analogous to the gangs and violent entrepreneurs it routinely employed, a virtual 'preman state'. The practice of beking came to epitomise the patron-client relations, multi-layered rackets and mutual expediency between elements of the regime and entrepreneurs in violence. The relationship was central to the street-level exercise of power, with preman operating as subcontracted state proxies, intimidating and discrediting opposition, extracting rents and conducting surveillance of the population. 'Bandit and ruler' effectively dealt in the same commodity, sharing interests in the extraction of illegal rents and the suppression of counter-hegemonic forces. The stability of these arrangements was contingent upon the strength of the political elites and military that supported them, along with the mediating and centralising power of Suharto. As cracks began to appear in the regime in the late 1990s and the nature and extent of beking became more transparent, these informal structural arrangements also started to fracture and morph in ways that reflected growing power struggles within elites, resistance to preman by the general populace and subsequent attempts by preman to reconfigure themselves in line with the changing political climate. The political utility of some preman gangs faded, as did that of their patrons, leading to new coalitions, alliances and rackets.

Close association with the discredited regime increasingly became a political and operational liability. The Pemuda Pancasila, for example, which dominated throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, found themselves in direct competition with new formations which gradually began to gain ascendency in Jakarta's streets. In contrast to their predecessors who pledged undying loyalty to nation, state and Golkar, the new guard of preman was characterised by reference to distinctly 'local' identities, territorial power framed in terms of local cultural idioms and ethnicised identities. As Schulte-Bockholt has argued, during a 'crisis of hegemony', elites seek alliances with organised crime and racketeering groups who in turn develop ideological affinities with them in order to facilitate their further integration within the structures of power (Schulte-Bockholt 2006). In the aftermath of the Petrus killings of the 1980s this was the case as preman flocked to military-backed nationalist youth organisations such as the PP and PPM. Pledges of ideological loyalty were necessary not just for consolidating rackets, but for physical survival.

However, as the New Order collapsed, culminating in the May 1998 riots and the forced resignation of Suharto, the city's administration found it was increasingly unable to control its populace, including its preman, who adopted new modes for legitimating rackets not necessarily dependent upon the ideological preferences or interests of elites.

Suharto's resignation meant not the complete collapse of beking networks, but rather the loss of their central focal hub, so that they loosened into decentralised and competing power centres and complex negotiated alliances between various interests. Faced with a fragmenting of *beking* arrangements, many preman networks started to reconfigure themselves away from dependency upon horizontal patronage patterns linked to national elites with the increasing political importance of the domain over which they ruled, the kampung. With the collapse of centralised power, assertions of place-based distinctiveness became the new grounds for 'securing rights to territories and resources' (Elmhirst 2001). Wee and Jayasuriya have argued that in Southeast Asia shifts in centre-periphery relations and the 'rescaling' of the state, often brought about by policies of decentralisation, have seen a trend towards localism and the ideology of 'indigenism', which they define as the 'articulation of rights that come from belonging to a place', in contestations over resources (Wee and Jayasuriya 2002, 3). In the unstable and fluxing post-New Order climate the reinvention of local identities and communities, and subsequent identification of 'outsiders', has become one strategy used by local elites and political thugs to consolidate rackets in ways not dependent upon national elites. Playing upon latent class and ethnic resentments over the perceived institutionalised inequalities of the New Order, often articulated through the revival of traditional cultural idioms of power, such as the jago, the assertion is made that original inhabitancy gives exclusivist rights over a given place.

Kusno has described how in post-1998 Jakarta the 'loosening' of power at the centre has resulted in a proliferation of civil groups formed around identities that 'are all linked by a sense that the nation-state no longer commands any power to protect and rule, or, at best, the political elites only safeguard their own interests' (Kusno 2004, 2384). This sense that political elites had little concern with improving the conditions of the general populace has, according to Kusno, encouraged these citizen groups, often violently, 'to act on their own, creating a condition in which everyone safeguards his or her own space, often without regard for the public' (Kusno 2004, 2384). The streets of the capital became a zone of contestation between a complex mix of interests: the poor and middle classes, the city's administration, property developers, business and new social and political forces. The Indonesian NGO Yappika documented the proliferation of this 'us vs. them' mentality, identifying 135 instances of communal and inter-neighbourhood violence in Jakarta in 2001–02 (Purnomo 2004).

In this aggressive politics of space, localism and indigenism became a new pole for contesting the territorial boundaries of these new forms of 'spatial power'. Finding itself with declining authority and subject to unparalleled

levels of scrutiny and resistance from its residents, the administration sought to find local partners to help it reassert itself. It found them amongst new networks of local militias, gangs and vigilantes citing localism and protection of the social and moral integrity of the neighbourhood as their core purpose. As we have seen, cooperation between the administration and preman groups is by no means a recent development. However, the changed nature of the socio-political environment and discursive space in which it has taken place has meant that preman groups and violent entrepreneurs have been able to use support from government to consolidate themselves in ways that have increased their independence from it.

This chapter will examine the transformation of beking patterns and state-preman alliances via a detailed analysis of preman 'turf politics' in the district of Tanah Abang in Central Jakarta. What is of particular interest in the case of Tanah Abang is how the transition from one protection regime to another took place against the backdrop of larger socio-political changes, the fracturing and collapse of the New Order. The Tanah Abang case illustrates how, as the New Order came to an end, the balance of power in the 'delicate mechanism' of beking critically altered in ways that favoured the interests of those preman who were able to reinvent themselves in line with the changed political and social environment. This consolidation and legitimation took place along several fronts: as 'protectors' of local communities from the detrimental effects of rapid social change, as 'community partners' with government in the policing of public space, and as private enterprises profiting from the growing demand for security.

The rise and fall of Hercules

> And from now on he would become a creature of the night. Sometimes with a pistol and sometimes with a knife he would seek his livelihood. This simple boy from the countryside would be forced to follow in the footsteps of all the criminals who had made history upon this earth, with an end already prepared for him as well.
>
> (Pramoedya Ananta Toer 2000, 142)

In the vision of Indonesia's first president, Sukarno, an engineer by training, Jakarta was to be a 'city of greatness': 'even in the little houses of the workers in Jakarta there must be a sense of greatness' (Abeyasekere 1987, 168). Sukarno's vision for Jakarta manifested primarily in the erection of grand monuments, sports stadiums and boulevards, rather than in the construction of basic infrastructure essential for a booming metropolis. What emerged were two faces to Jakarta: spacious arterial roads lined with modern buildings, which masked overcrowded, polluted shanty towns filled with those seeking an escape from the grinding poverty afflicting most of the country throughout the late 1950s and early 1960s.[1] These two faces have diversified, but the tensions between them have nonetheless persisted into the present. After his

appointment as governor by Sukarno in 1966, former Marine Corps commander Ali Sadikin instigated what would become a government tradition: operations aimed at 'cleaning' Jakarta's streets of the poor, including street sellers and vendors, beggars and *becak* pedicab drivers who were rounded up in raids and dumped on the outskirts of the city (Abeyasakere 1984, 14). Identifying many of the poor as recent migrants, in 1970 he declared Jakarta a 'closed city', requiring proof of employment, accommodation and an identity card for all residents.[2] Despite these measures, which in practice were impossible to enforce, the economic boom of the 1970s was matched by constant waves of migration that saw the city's population steadily increase. As Jakarta grew as the country's economic and political centre, the value of land increased and the interests of capital and developers took precedence over providing for the needs of its ordinary citizens.

The failure of the New Order to provide sufficient investment in basic public infrastructure, low-cost housing or the provision of secure space for informal economic activity resulted in Jakarta's poor colonising the streets, making use of every spare inch of public space to eke out a living. To New Order officials this informal economy was not just 'backward' and not in keeping with its ideology of development, but was considered a potential threat to public order as large numbers of people in the streets could easily turn into riots or social unrest. The informal economy was also, by its very nature, an economy that operated outside state regulation and taxation. Preman constituted an important source of informal authority in this street economy, which through beking networks brought in revenue for officials and offered a degree of policing and social control on the state's behalf. In particular, any efforts by vendors at developing representative organisations, networks or unions were systematically harassed by preman, who like the state shared a vested interest in suppressing social forces that could disrupt their localised hegemonies.[3]

In efforts to bring the informal street economy under greater state control, during the 1980s new multi-storey market complexes run by the state company PD Pasar Jaya were built in traditional market areas such as Tanah Abang, Pasar Senen and other established areas of trade into which street sellers were expected to move. The high rents meant that many had little option but to remain in the streets. These dark and overcrowded market buildings also provided a suitably shadowy environment for preman gangs to operate undisturbed, though in this regard the streets were little better. Throughout the 1980s raids on street vendors were commonplace as the government continued its largely futile drive to formalise them within the PD Pasar Jaya market buildings (Murray 1991, 89–90). The persistence and resilience of street traders, who would return as soon as the raids were over, saw the state resort to more extreme measures. For example, in the mid-1980s fires destroyed traditional markets and shantytowns in areas demarcated for clearance such as Manggarai and Bongkaran under suspicious circumstances (Abeyasakere 1987, 91).[4]

The district of Tanah Abang in Central Jakarta has been a major centre for trade since the eighteenth century, primarily in textiles, but also livestock, food produce and more recently electronic goods. According to 2004 figures the Tanah Abang market has over 7,400 registered traders, over 3,000 unregistered vendors, an average of 10,000 shoppers visiting it each day, with a yearly turnover of over 90 trillion rupiah.[5] It is recognised as one of the largest textile markets in Southeast Asia and is the biggest source of revenue for PD Pasar Jaya.[6] This volume of concentrated economic transaction and commercial activity, much of it informal, has made it a particularly lucrative 'honey pot' for both preman 'in uniform' and those without. The district has a well-established local tradition of jago and racketeering (Fauzi 2004). The legendary Betawi jago Si Pitung is reputed to have embarked on his career after suffering the indignity of being pick-pocketed while selling goats in Tanah Abang, and other legendary jago such as Haji Sabeni made their name in the markets streets. After independence the market was also a popular 'hunting ground' for members of the various laskar militia units mobilised during the revolution. As one Tanah Abang taxi driver related, 'here there are all kinds of terms for "money", security money, "just passing by" money, commission money…there isn't an inch of land here that isn't used by preman to extract money'.[7]

Throughout the mid-1990s a significant portion of this protection money was extracted by a small wiry East Timorese youth known by the moniker Hercules, whose gang held sway over the district's streets and markets. Hercules Rozario Marcal, the son of a Dili farmer, had been brought to Jakarta from East Timor in the late 1980s as part of a publicity campaign funded by the president's eldest daughter, Tutut Rukmana, and her Tiara Foundation.[8] The campaign was part of a broader strategic campaign, conceptualised by Prabowo, to embrace 'the outcasts of Timorese society' by giving them jobs and training in return for their loyalty to Indonesia, and as a means to counter increasingly negative international perceptions of Indonesia's occupation (Wandelt 2007, 133). This strategy would later be significantly expanded by him in East Timor via the establishment of pro-government militias such as Gada Paksi (*Garda Muda Penegak Integrasi*, or Youth Guard Upholding Integration), which terrorised the population while engaging in racketeering and gambling. Given a job making electrical parts in a Jakarta workshop, Hercules and several dozen fellow Timorese soon became frustrated with the low wages and poor conditions and left for a life on the streets, with Hercules earning a living selling cigarettes in Tanah Abang.[9] Here he found himself on the receiving end of local preman, but soon developed a reputation for fighting back, often with his machete. In his own words:

> During that period I slept under a bridge. I never slept soundly, and always kept a sword close by. Even if I went for a shower I would bring my sword, because at any moment an enemy might attack.[10]

As his name spread, so did his followers. By 1993 his gang of mainly eastern Indonesian youths was said to number close to 400. In 1994 Hercules's gang was able successfully to wrest control of the Jatibunder sub-district of Tanah Abang from predominantly ethnic Betawi and Madurese gangs, gaining a stranglehold over protection rackets in the lucrative main market building and over prostitution in Bongkaran, where they established a headquarters.

From an early age Hercules had been close to the military in East Timor, and was informally 'adopted' by the Indonesian military in the mid-1980s after the death of his parents, who were reportedly killed in the aerial bombing of Ainaro in 1978 (Klinken 2012, 123). He served as an Operations Assistant (*Tenaga Bantuan Operasi*, or TBO) for the Indonesian military and was dedicated to the task, continuing to serve as an equipment carrier even after losing an eye and a hand during fighting with Falantil guerrillas in 1988.[11] It is during this period that Hercules developed close ties with Prabowo Subianto, who was head of Kostrad's 328 Airborne Battalion in East Timor during 1988–89, as well as Major-General Zacky Anwar Makarim – two relationships that would shape and determine his fate for years to come.[12] According to Hercules, he 'owed his life' to Prabowo from this period, and that from that time Prabowo became 'the only man who can strike me without me lifting a hand to retaliate'.[13]

Through his role as a TBO he qualified as a member of Pemuda Panca Marga, and later a military pension, with these connections proving crucial in his consolidation over protection in Tanah Abang. According to Ryter, Hercules and his gang were regularly contracted by the New Order to harass and demonstrate against pro-independence East Timorese in the capital as well as the US and Australian embassies, successfully 'outbidding' Pemuda Pancasila for the right to do so (Ryter 1998, 69). By his own admission Hercules was regularly called upon to 'beat up' independence activists, his Timorese heritage adding 'authenticity' to the attacks.[14] Support for integration within Hercules's gang, however, was not unanimous. The experience of the Tiara programme had done little to endear the regime to gang members, and for most, involvement in Hercules's gang was a combination of survival strategy and ethnic and regional solidarity.[15] Beking practices required preman to pay lip service to state ideology and its political imperatives in return for material concessions and protection, but this did not necessarily translate into loyalty. Despite ostensive support for the regime, the families of gang members in East Timor continued to suffer hardships under Indonesian rule, leading to a crisis of conscience for many within Hercules's gang.[16]

A report from the Indonesians in Solidarity Struggle with the Maubere People (*Solidaritas Perjuangan Rakyat Indonesia untuk Maubere*, or SPRIM) details that in June 1996 an associate of Hercules's gang, Manuel Soares, was shot dead by Tanah Abang police, allegedly after refusing to surrender when caught 'engaged in criminal activity'.[17] The report suggests that Soares, another runaway from the Tiara programme, was killed due to his refusal to join Hercules's gang in pro-integration rallies and act as an informer on

pro-independence East Timorese in Jakarta. It is impossible to verify the exact reasons for Soares's shooting; however, Duartes Freitas, Hercules's right-hand man and a close friend of Soares, was convinced it was politically motivated. Soon after the shooting he issued his own press release in which he stated: 'let it be known that there were motives behind the death of Manuel Soares, a fugitive from the military, who died because he refused to work with BAIS and police intelligence in Tanah Abang'.[18] In the wake of Soares's death, members of Hercules's gang joined with SPRIM, SMID and PRD activists, whom a year earlier they had been paid to attack, in a demonstration at the national parliament protesting Soares's death.[19] Such open displays of dissent would undoubtedly have angered Hercules's military backers, especially the alliance, albeit temporary, with SMID and the PRD. The backing of Kopassus, or at least the rumours of it, helped Hercules's gang become top dog in Tanah Abang, but it came at a heavy price, one that not all of his gang were happy to pay.

Prior to Soares's death, cracks had begun to appear in Hercules's hegemony. His reputation for being brutal and unforgiving in his extraction of protection money from Tanah Abang's vendors won him little loyalty outside his own gang, even from fellow PPM members who perhaps already suspected that his time at the top was coming to an end. On average, street vendors were charged Rp.200,000 per month for a 1-metre square segment of roadside, though this 'rent' could be increased at any time and was often doubled during peak periods such as Ramadan.[20] Local vendors did not miss the irony that someone formerly 'one of their own', who some felt had bravely fought back against preman, had now become the nastiest kind of thug – as one described, 'a vendor's worst nightmare'.[21] A racketeer is by definition both a 'protector' and an 'exploiter'. Violence is used to extract tribute, but is rationalised by the perpetrator and often the victim as the lesser of two evils, the extorter offering protection against other potentially more brutal or expensive exploiters. Hercules's error in this respect was to neglect to foster his appearance as a protector. In doing so, he failed to legitimate his forced extraction of tribute as anything other than what it was, confident in the belief that rumours of his military backing would protect him from retaliation. The Jatibunder gang had already attacked and seriously injured Hercules in early 1995 and, along with the predominantly Madurese Jatibaru gang, hesitated to launch a more sustained offensive against him due to fears that his Kopassus backers would intervene.[22] Tanah Abang authorities were also reluctant to take any decisive action despite frequent complaints from vendors, and on the occasions when Hercules was brought in by the police, he was inevitably released without being charged, confirming belief in his invulnerability.[23]

It was rather an internal split that precipitated the unravelling of Hercules's Tanah Abang empire. A gang member from West Papua named Anis had broken away from Hercules and established his own gang in late 1995, soon after the Jatibunder gang attack.[24] Initially the Anis group was small in size,

but by mid-1996 it had grown considerably, its sphere of influence extending to streets in front of the main textile market, threatening to overlap with Hercules's most lucrative section of turf. Beginning on 18 January 1997 around 100 youths from the rival gangs fought pitched battles with knives, swords and clubs over the space of two days, sending panic through the market's crowded streets and bringing Tanah Abang's busy trade to a standstill.[25] In the melee Hercules was stabbed and taken to hospital, the fighting only abating after the arrival of Jakarta Military Command troops and the arrest of 24 of those involved, most of whom were from Anis's gang. The military, police and Peace and Order Guard (*Kantor Ketentraman dan Ketertiban* or *Tramtib*), a municipal police unit, continued to restrict traffic in and out of the area over the following week, severely affecting trade. Many traders were forced to shut up shop entirely; the normally crowded markets were empty of shoppers. After a week of this economic lockdown, the frustration of vendors erupted in another outbreak of violence, this time directed at the authorities.

On 27 January 1997 scuffles reportedly broke out between a vendor and several Tramtib officers who were collecting 'compulsory' rents. Seeing the vendor being beaten by Tramtib, others rushed to his aid and the officers were forced to make a quick exit in their van. Rumours spread that the escaping vehicle had hit and killed a local youth, and within hours a mob of angry vendors and residents descended on the Tanah Abang sub-district office which they then proceeded to torch and burn to the ground along with several cars belonging to government workers.[26] Coming in the wake of riots in Tasikmalaya, Situbondo and outbreaks of sectarian violence in Kalimantan, the Tanah Abang incident gained significant media attention, and was cited by critics of the regime as a further sign of the New Order's increasing precariousness.[27]

Despite the insistence of vendors that overzealous Tramtib sparked the incident, official fingers immediately started to point towards Hercules and his gang as the provocateurs. The mayor of Central Jakarta, retired General Abdul Kahfi, stated: 'it's not possible that traders would be audacious enough to start a riot like this unless there was a third party provoking them.'[28] The Army Chief of Staff Hartono also weighed in, suggesting that there was clearly a 'third party' behind the incident.[29] Trying to deflect criticism from the unpopular Tramtib, Kahfi suggested the riot was a reaction to their 'efficiency', which was so great that local preman had found their regular rackets disrupted and hence deliberately sought to instigate violence against the authorities.[30] There was some truth in the accusation. The lockdown of the main market area had prevented Hercules and his gang from collecting their regular protection fees and given Tramtib officers, some of whom were recruited from rival ethnic Batak gangs, an opportunity to gain a foothold.[31]

Responding to the allegations, two weeks after the incident Hercules's gang took the unusual step of holding an impromptu press conference in a Tanah Abang parking lot in order to deny involvement in the riots and the rumours

of backing from Kopassus.[32] Soon afterwards Prabowo followed suit, denying any connection with the gang, saying that he had 'never met Hercules before', and that 'Kopassus would not associate with common thugs'.[33] Prabowo's public denial of involvement with Hercules came as no surprise, as beking arrangements were always an open secret. The timing, however, proved crucial. Divisions within Hercules's group over the East Timor issue had continued to simmer since Soares's shooting and had been exacerbated by the conflict with Anis and the Jatibunder gang. As a result, Hercules was finding it harder to mobilise pro-integration protestors when ordered to do so.[34] This was reportedly much to the annoyance of Kopassus intelligence, which had recently intensified its campaign to counter growing international pressure on Indonesia over human rights abuses in East Timor.[35]

As Lindsey has argued, beking is a 'delicate mechanism' as it delegates power from the state to preman, directing their private violence towards state objectives (Lindsey 2006). This same power, however, could turn the 'empowered' preman into competitors, a general nuisance, or at least a scandalous embarrassment. For preman, patronage arrangements were always fraught with danger. Changes in the political climate, elite rivalries or a shift in the political strategy of their backers could all easily result in a withdrawal of support, leaving them exposed to challengers and the wrath of those they had preyed upon. If Hercules was no longer considered a reliable partner in mobilising East Timorese in Jakarta and could not maintain a low-profile monopoly over protection in Tanah Abang, then for Prabowo's purposes or those of the local administration he was no longer of any use. Although Hercules's denial of Prabowo's patronage was intended to clear his name and possibly protect his patron, Prabowo took the opportunity to confirm it publicly – a move that was ultimately to seal Hercules's fate in Tanah Abang.[36] The month-long spate of violence had a damaging impact upon the local economy and further alienated the gang from some of its more affluent clients.[37] Hercules and his gang, in the words of one local government official, had 'overstepped the boundaries', and were now a significant liability in the eyes of the mayor, military and other local stake holders.[38] The consensus was that Hercules needed to be removed, and without the threat of repercussions from his backer all that remained was to decide how and when it would be done, and who would replace him.

Larger political tensions in Jakarta had also started to impact upon the division of territory in Jakarta's streets. The 27 July 1996 incident at the PDI headquarters had drawn public attention to the corruption of the New Order and the extent to which it relied upon preman in its stratagems of power. It also prompted reshuffling within military ranks and resulted in the appointment of Lieutenant-General Sutiyoso as Jakarta's new governor. A former deputy commander of Kopassus, he had been an aide to Wiranto during his term as Jakarta's military commander (1994–95) before taking over the post in 1996. Along with General Suparman, also an aide to Wiranto, Sutiyoso had worked to form civilian militias and paramilitary groups in 1994. As

such, he came to the job with his own well-established preman networks, and a familiarity with strategies for using them in the task of urban governance. He later used his experience and networks in mobilising the Pamswakarsa, a 100,000-strong civilian militia consisting of an assortment of Muslim groups sympathetic to the interim presidency of Habibie, including new vigilante groups such as the FPI, martial arts and semi-criminal youth groups from Banten, together with the nationalist groups such as PP, and the unemployed.[39] Deployed in the lead-up to the special legislative session of the People's Consultative Assembly in November 1998, following Suharto's resignation, it was intended as a counter to student-led opposition to Habibie.[40]

During the course of the following months, negotiations took place between the Jatibunder and Jatibaru gangs, Mayor Kahfi and the local military commander.[41] The result was the formation of a new 'community' organisation, the Family of Tanah Abang Association (*Ikatan Keluarga Besar Tanah Abang*, or IKBT) which was given a mandate to deal with the 'preman problem' in Tanah Abang. Yusuf Masehi, known locally as Bang Ucu, was appointed as the association's head.[42] An ethnic Betawi and a life-long resident of Tanah Abang, Ucu started out as a goat seller before making a name for himself as a jago in the early 1980s.[43] His reputed credentials and lineage as a Betawi jago were impeccable and he was popularly believed to be a descendent of Haji Sabeni (1860–1945), a Betawi martial artist from Tanah Abang renowned for his opposition to colonial and Japanese rule.[44] In Betawi and pencak silat tradition more generally, the existence of a lineage was crucial to the legitimisation of a jago within his community, acting as a type of 'contract' of accountability to pre-established norms of behaviour. Ucu's deputy was Abraham Lunggana, known locally as Haji Lulung, who as a prominent member within the PPM had close military links, as well as running his own security company, Putra Perkasa, which controlled parking in parts of central and north Jakarta.[45]

Ucu proclaimed himself 'Betawi War Commander' (*Panglima Perang Betawi*), ready to 'make the neighbourhood safe again from outsiders who cause trouble'.[46] In contrast to the brutal Hercules, an 'outsider' renowned for his links to gambling and prostitution, Ucu drew his power from the folklore and culture of the Betawi jago, although like all good jago, he also had his own network of contacts with those in power, including former high school classmates such as General Ryamizard Ryacudu.[47] Ucu had been instrumental in establishing the first branch of the PP in Tanah Abang in 1982 and had been contracted as security for gambling dens and bars run by Chinese businessmen.[48] This changed after one of his 16 children developed a serious drug problem. An Islamic scholar from whom Ucu sought spiritual guidance advised him that his son's addiction was brought about by the 'dirty' money that Ucu used to provide for his family.[49] Ucu claims this was a transformative experience, prompting him to 'change my ways'.[50] He became involved with local pencak silat schools, worked with community Islamic leaders and became known as a devout Muslim, fulfilling a cultural archetype of the

wayward youth who is reborn as a charismatic, religiously inspired leader. Through his excessive violence Hercules had alienated himself, opening the way for an 'honourable jago' to come to the rescue. The IKBT consciously revived the myth of the Betawi jago, Ucu, describing the jago, in contrast to the predatory preman, as a *palang dade*, a 'protector' of the community from external threats, and a defender of the most vulnerable.[51] Hercules's links to prostitution and gambling also served to bolster support for Ucu and the IKBT within Tanah Abang's religious community.[52]

Despite his affiliation with the Betawi-dominated Jatibunder gang, Ucu's central role in negotiating an alliance with the Jatibaru gang made him something of a jago diplomat, and he gained a reputation in gang circles as a moderate figure willing to compromise.[53] In the shifting political climate, the mayor and military commanders saw the strategic value of backing a 'moral gangster' who had strong cultural and social links to the community and bi-partisan gang support. By April 1997, now no doubt aware of the looming threat to his rule, Hercules made a last desperate signal to the regime that he was a loyal subject worthy of protection, issuing a press release in which he proclaimed his support and hopes for success for the 1997 general elections. However, even bigger processes of change were now at work, which were beyond his or anyone else's control. By July 1997 the impact of the East Asian economic crisis that had begun in Thailand several months earlier, began to hit Indonesia. Unemployment rates grew rapidly along with inflation. As a district dependent upon retail trade, Tanah Abang was especially hard hit by the monetary crisis, with many smaller businesses forced to close. In this climate, tolerance of Hercules's high taxes grew thinner and the size of rival gangs increased as more Tanah Abang locals were forced by circumstances to join, while others were attracted to the area due to the concentration of an informal cash economy. All these factors contributed to an atmosphere conducive for a changing of the preman guard in Tanah Abang.

On 19 November 1997 a hotel used as a meeting place by Hercules's gang was burnt to the ground, the fire also destroying adjacent houses and dormitories used by Hercules's men.[54] The fire was alleged to have been started by residents upset at the behaviour of the gang. This was the first stage of the IKBT offensive. Over the next couple of days several members of Hercules's gang were individually targeted and savagely beaten, and the street stalls that they owned were destroyed. Identifying the attackers as from the Jatibaru gang, Hercules attempted to launch a revenge assault but was prevented by a road blockade manned by troops from the Jakarta regional military command (*Kodam Jaya*), who threatened to open fire if he and his followers did not retreat.[55] Several days later the combined forces of the Jatibunder and Jatibaru gangs launched the final wave of the offensive under the IKBT banner. A mob of several hundred attacked Hercules and around 100 of his gang when they were gathered at their headquarters, a warehouse in Bongkaran, near the Tanah Abang train station. For nearly 24 hours Hercules's gang was trapped inside whilst the rival gangs attacked with machetes, swords

and rocks. In a scene reminiscent of the 27 July incident, Kodam Jaya troops are said to have watched the attacks from a distance with weapons at the ready but no shots were fired. Four of Hercules's gang were killed in the attack.

With gang members dead, over a dozen missing, continuing threats from the IKBT, and abandoned by their former patrons, Hercules and his followers were forced out of Tanah Abang. The gang's headquarters was destroyed and its contents confiscated by Tramtib.[56] Hercules moved his 'office' to the nearby area of Jalan Rasuna Said and took up temporary residence in the West Java town of Indramayu. His reign in Tanah Abang was over; however, as we shall see in Chapter 7, Hercules was by no means a 'spent force' in Jakarta's underworld. The political revival of his former military patrons, in particular Prabowo and his new political party, Gerindra, would see him once more emerge as 'useful', albeit in a radically different political landscape. Other gang members left Jakarta for Bekasi and Bogor.[57] Hercules's expulsion from Tanah Abang was heralded as a 'victory' for local people over a vicious and immoral thug, a justified citizen-initiated response from a community fed up with thuggery, violence and vice. Tanah Abang community leaders praised the action as an unfortunate but 'necessary act' to expel troublemaking outsiders from the district.[58] Since the onset of the 1997 economic crisis, the number of vigilante and lynch mob attacks on petty criminals and preman had grown, making it easy to portray the orchestrated takeover as an instance of 'street justice'. The new preman regime had given itself an aura of popular legitimacy, one not dependent upon rumours of backing from powerful figures. The reality, though, was that Hercules's opponents had the logistical support of the mayor and local military and the takeover had been highly coordinated, not 'spontaneous' as had been suggested. For vendors, little had changed. As one remarked, 'for traders it's all the same. Whichever preman is in control, they'll continue to extort us'.[59]

A new paradigm: the Family of Tanah Abang Association

The takeover signalled a shift towards a new mode of organisation for preman in Tanah Abang, the community vigilante invoking images of the charismatic and honour-bound jago of popular legend. With its own rich folklore of jago and silat masters, this means of representation for the new preman regime struck a chord with many long-term Tanah Abang residents, as did the IKBT's strong stance against gambling, drugs and prostitution.[60] The formation and use of local security groups was portrayed as an empowerment of local communities to self-police in lieu of the under-resourced and discredited police. Mayor Kahfi made the takeover official when he recruited 48 men drawn from each of the two main gangs into a 'District Civil Defence Unit' (*Keamanan Distrik*, or *Matrik*), which was given authorisation to patrol the Tanah Abang markets.[61] The Matrik guards were told they would be given a monthly income of Rp.250,000, which like Hansip guards was to come directly from traders, not government. The guards were instructed not

to extract further payments from vendors, and given a mandate to take action against any unaffiliated preman who attempted to operate in the market area, especially those linked to Hercules.

For a period of several months Tanah Abang experienced a period of 'relative calm' as the Matrik force kept other preman at bay, and struggling vendors gained a reprieve from overlapping rackets and disruptions caused by inter-gang warfare. The Matrik force and the IKBT were instrumental in coordinating a 'fence of legs' (*pagar petis*) to protect the district from rioters during the upheavals of May 1998 resulting in Suharto's resignation.[62] In contrast to other market districts such as Glodok, Tanah Abang emerged from the riots relatively unscathed. This increased the popularity of both, especially amongst some of the larger retail store owners in the area.

However, by June 1999 the alliance between the Jatibaru and Jatibunder groups under the umbrella of the IKBT had begun to deteriorate. The failure of the local government to fund the Matrik force created confusion amongst traders as to who was to pay them and how much, resulting in many of the guards receiving less than the agreed amount. Consequently many returned to demanding fees from vendors, which in turn revived gang rivalries over the division of territorial zones.[63] Pak Ogah (known in Tanah Abang as *Nyeletrek*) and unaffiliated preman flooded into the area, with vendors and minivan drivers once more forced to pay multiple rackets. Tensions over the division of turf and the failure of the Matrik initiative prompted a fresh round of negotiations facilitated by the Jakarta government and mediated by Bang Ucu.[64] A new agreement was reached: two days after the end of the 1999 general election, the Jatibunder gang would surrender its control of the lower half of Kebonjati Street to the Jatibaru gang. Kebonjati was the site of Tanah Abang's main market and hence one of the core zones for protection rackets due to the high concentration of vendors and public transport.[65]

Having taken part in expelling Hercules, the Jatibaru gang felt that it had a right to access the area. As one Jatibaru member stated at the time, 'the youths here also want to get a taste of the money from the street stall vendors'.[66] With one day left before the official handover, the Jatibaru gang, apparently convinced that Jatibunder would go back on the agreement and refuse to relinquish control, decided to take it pre-emptively by force.[67] Jatibaru gang members converged on the main market and over the space of three days the two gangs threw rocks and bottles at one another, once more bringing commerce in Tanah Abang to a standstill.[68] Eventually the fighting was brought to an end when police erected barricades across Kebonjati Street, physically separating the two groups. In contrast to previous conflicts, the military was not present. The factional loyalties resulting from the elections had further complicated lines of territorial control. The Betawi faction of the IKBT was closely affiliated with the PPP and Golkar, while many of the Jatibaru gang and their families supported the PDI-P and PKB (*Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa*, or National Awakening Party). It is possible that the Jatibaru gang felt either that the dominance of Golkar and PPP in Tanah

Abang would result in reneging on the agreement, or that the success of the PDI-P in Jakarta would afford them the political backup to take turf by force.

The police barricade replaced the 'invisible line' upon which the territorial division was based, but as soon as it was removed the threat of one group once more 'overstepping' was inevitable. Fighting broke out again, this time taking on overtly ethnic overtones. A number of local Betawi leaders linked to the Ucu faction of the IKBT began publicly labelling the largely Madurese Jatibaru gang as migrant 'outsiders' taking liberties at the expense of 'indigenous' locals.[69] The involvement of Jatibaru gangs in controlling prostitution along the Tanah Abang railway line was cited by Betawi groups as evidence that their rivals were not only 'outsiders' but, like Hercules, also a morally corrupting influence on the community.[70] Bang Ucu, who previously brokered the alliance, also played upon the emerging 'local vs. other' rhetoric, stating that: 'those who are called Tanah Abang preman, not one of them is from Tanah Abang. It's outsiders that take advantage and make trouble.'[71] 'Preman' were, by Ucu's definition, 'not from here', implying that those who were locals had a default legitimacy and inherent 'right' in monopolising protection. In the context of a city described by the Indonesian writer Seno Geno Ajidarma as a place 'where everyone is assumed as having a place of origin elsewhere', this aggressive ethnicised localism was a distinctly new phenomenon, although it mirrored to a lesser extent the dramatic increase in communal and sectarian violence in other parts of the country (Ajidarma 2002, 19).[72] Tanah Abang itself has long been an ethnic and cultural melting pot, with significant populations of Chinese, Arabs, Indians and Minangkabau alongside Betawi. Suharto's replacement, Habibie, had already outlined his radical plan for political decentralisation and the implementation of regional autonomy throughout the country, the implications of which were already beginning to seep into local turf wars.

The illusion of a united community response to Hercules collapsed to expose an even more complex web of gang rivalries intertwined with business rivalries, ethnic sentiment and political allegiances, further exacerbated by the failure of local government to fund and administer its own initiative adequately. Now consisting largely of the Betawi-dominated Jatibunder group, the IKBT continued to receive the backing of Kahfi. The predominantly Madurese Jatibaru gang formed its own organisation, the Family of Jatibaru Association (*Ikatan Keluarga Jati Baru* or IKJB). Its territory was limited to an area extending from Jatibaru Street to Pasar Kambing, a distance of a few hundred metres. Their impatient pre-emptive strike ultimately lost them access to Kebonjati Street and, more importantly, government support.

Sutiyoso's 'anti-preman' campaign

> The Regional Government for the district of Jakarta holds the mandate to create a capital city which is orderly, safe, comfortable, clean, and beautiful, so that Jakarta is representative of a capital city. However, the regional government faces

> the obstacle of unhindered urbanization and it is mostly the people with social welfare problems who obstruct the [public order laws]. Because of that, the regional government has chosen the means of law enforcement.[73]

The turmoil created by the fracturing of the IKBT coalition prompted Sutiyoso to issue a statement that 'those of you, who consider yourselves hoodlums, please change your profession to something more legitimate. The city administration will do its best to create more job opportunities for all jobless city residents'.[74] For some of these 'hoodlums', an offer of jobs was soon on the table. The 'indigenous' Betawi identity of Ucu's IKBT held a distinctly utilitarian value for the governor. Supporting the IKBT's identification of 'preman' and other 'troublemakers' as migrant outsiders, Sutiyoso used this as the basis for establishing alliances with Jakarta's preman and harnessing them to the task of reconsolidating his security-orientated approach to governing Jakarta. In 1999 he reactivated the policy of restricting migration into the capital and systematically harassing those making a living in the informal street economy.[75] However, the beginning of Sutiyoso's governorship had coincided with the onset of the 1997 economic crisis which precipitated the end of the New Order less than a year later. At the same time that public space was increasingly being transformed into economic space by the urban poor struggling to make a living, the coercive power of government was being significantly curtailed as a consequence of dramatic shifts in the political climate. The crisis impacted heavily not just upon Jakarta's poor, but also its middle class, many of whom resorted to street cafés and food stalls as a source of income after losing their jobs in management (Kusno 2004, 2382). With such strong social and economic pressures, any effort to develop or transform public space by the administration was met with immediate and often violent resistance.[76] Here an automatic alliance emerged between a city administration struggling to maintain control over the organic transformation of Jakarta's streets and neighbourhoods, and criminal groups and gangs seeking means to re-establish rackets in the wake of the fracturing of patronage networks post-1998. The form this alliance took was, ironically, cooperation in the carrying out of 'anti-preman' public order campaigns.

Another Matrik defence force was set up by the mayor's office with Sutiyoso's backing, consisting of around 100 personnel described as 'local vendors', most of whom were from the IKBT. However, once again funding was not provided, traders being responsible for paying the guards and providing them with uniforms. Operating now as the 'legitimate' security of Tanah Abang, the IKBT began charging minivan drivers a standard Rp.1,000 'tax' each time they passed through the area. Nevertheless, despite the public backing of both the mayor and governor, the IKBT was unable to establish a monopoly over protection in Tanah Abang's crowded streets. The sheer number of people made it a near-impossible task. In June 2000 minivan drivers staged a two-day protest over the IKBT's government-sanctioned fee.[77] The drivers argued that prior to the IKBT fee they had paid local Pak Ogah

on average around Rp.100–300 every time they entered the market area.[78] The issue of contention was not that the IKBT was imposing the fee, but that they were still being forced to pay other preman as well. Basing its legitimacy upon the ability to monopolise protection fees, the IKBT had failed. It seemed that even with the support of government it was impossible for any one group to gain effective control. The drivers only returned to work after obtaining a guarantee from the police chief that the IKBT would stop enforcing the levy.

Soon after the strike action the IKBT affiliated itself with the Anti-Communist Alliance (*Aliansi Anti-Komunis*, or AAK), a mix of 35 Islamic and nationalist militia groups that included the Front Hizbullah, *Pemuda Betawi* (Betawi Youth) and the former East Timorese Aitarak militia leader, Eurico Gutterres.[79] The focus of the AAK's activities was conducting 'sweeping operations' of booksellers accused of selling communist publications. Material critical of Suharto and the military was also targeted, and it was suspected that the AAK was funded by elements within Golkar to curb the burgeoning critical press.[80] The IKBT set up 'anti-communist command-posts' around Tanah Abang and hung provocative banners stating that Jakarta's Betawi would 'smash' any communist activity.[81] Local labour and transport worker activists suggested this was a strategic move to discredit any further coordinated resistance by street vendors to the IKBT levies, and stifle attempts by activists to unionise the aggrieved minibus drivers.[82] In rallying to suppress counter-hegemonic forces that threatened to challenge their localised rackets, preman resorted to a New Order trope that nonetheless continued to assure support from elements of the city's elites. Accusations in the media that the IKBT and other Betawi groups were on the governor and Golkar's payroll had been further fuelled by the IKBT's mobilisation against forces loyal to President Abdurahman Wahid.[83] In the wake of the Nahdatul Ulama's 2001 conference in Jakarta and the looming possibility of the president's impeachment, thousands of Wahid supporters from East Java flooded into the capital, including large contingents of party paramilitaries from Banser and Ansor. Bang Ucu and the IKBT took to the streets, replete in traditional jago outfits. The reason given for the show of force was not partisan political support for its alleged backers as many suspected, but the protection of the neighbourhood:

> We don't want to get involved in politics, what's important is that our kampung is safe…just imagine people coming into our kampung bearing *clurit* (a sickle identified with Madurese culture), how could you not be annoyed. Maybe they have clurit, but we have golok.[84]

The group presented itself as a non-partisan community response to safeguard the city against potential trouble-making 'others', masking, albeit crudely, the struggles for control over protection rackets in the city, which were increasingly determined by alignments to the new predominant political forces. In particular, paramilitary forces close to the president such as Banser, but also the satgas of PDI-P, had made significant inroads into areas

previously monopolised by the PP and groups affiliated to Golkar, such as security for casinos. This in part was due to the calculations of illicit business owners that the use of forces linked to the ruling coalition was a potentially more effective buffer against police raids (MacDougall 2003). Similarly, businesses in Tanah Abang were also reconsidering their preferred choices of security provider based upon the changing political climate. Using those close to marginalised or unpopular political forces posed the potential for economic disruption.

In April 2001 Sutiyoso, in response to public outcry over skyrocketing crime rates and preman activity, announced a six-month campaign to 'eliminate preman' (*basmi preman*) from Jakarta's streets.[85] A budget of Rp.12 billion taken from the administration's public order funds was allocated and 2,800 security personnel were assigned to the task that pinpointed 73 'hubs of disturbance'.[86] Sutiyoso requested that the public assist by 'providing information, and if you can by catching them [preman] and handing them over to the police'.[87] 'Public assistance' included the administration extending a hand to those whom many considered to be the campaign's rightful target. Despite the failure of the IKBT to consolidate control over Tanah Abang, the organisation was heralded as a success story by Sutiyoso – a community-driven initiative to deal with the problem of preman that should be emulated throughout the capital. On invitation, Bang Ucu and other IKBT leaders met with the governor and were asked to give input on how best to tackle the problem of preman in Jakarta. The IKBT proposal was a familiar one: that unemployed youth and those identified as 'at risk of becoming preman' should be given training by the police and then provided with jobs by the local administration as security guards.[88] In essence, the IKBT recommended a revised version of the failed Matrik guard system, with the difference being that the government should foot the bill. Ucu was naively confident the plan would succeed: 'just create cooperation between officials and the IKBT. We can handle all of Jakarta, let alone Tanah Abang.'[89] Sutiyoso responded by recruiting an extra 800 'police assistants' (*Bantuan Polisi*, or *Banpol*) as part of the campaign, a percentage of whom were drawn from the previous People's Security (*Keamanan Rakyat*, or *Kamra*), a short-lived, military-trained unit established by General Wiranto as part of his revived 'national discipline' campaign, and a significant proportion coming from the ranks of the IKBT and its affiliates (Bertrand 2004b, 336–37).

The publicity and fanfare surrounding the campaign gave ample warning to its ostensive targets to keep well out of sight, so when Sutiyoso hit the streets of Tanah Abang with a media entourage, it came as little surprise that no preman were to be found, apart from the ones now wearing Banpol and Tramtib uniforms. Two months into the campaign public scepticism grew, with the media along with some parliamentarians suggesting it was a waste of time and money.[90] The reality for vendors was that it was Tramtib officers, Banpol or the police themselves who had taken over from local preman as the ones demanding fees, 'preman in uniform' replacing those without.[91] In this

respect the 2001 campaign served a dual purpose: to allow the weakened police and its auxiliaries to re-establish control over informal levies and protection fees that they had lost since 1998, and to create pressure on unaffiliated preman to join groups in partnership with government such as the IKBT. It was to become a format that, as we shall see in Chapter 6, would be used frequently by the administration.

Unsurprisingly, a high degree of ambiguity surrounded exactly what criteria the authorities were using to identify someone as a 'preman'. Without catching someone in the act of committing an offence, identification depended upon local rumour, the prejudices of arresting officers or 'circumstantial evidence' such as apparent markers of identification with the criminal world, like tattoos.[92] Consequently, many of those arrested were guilty of little more than being in the wrong place at the wrong time and the campaign appeared more as a symbolic 'purge' than an effective response to crime. The real target of the 'anti-preman campaign' appeared to be less thugs and gangsters than their usual victims. Subsequently, one effect of the campaign was to confer some legitimacy to established groups by way of omission, a pattern that, as we shall see, was reproduced in subsequent campaigns.

Another outcome was contractual arrangements between businesses and security company spinoffs from the IKBT. Larger retail stores and owners of Tanah Abang's market blocks were keen to prevent petty criminals and gangs from operating within the main retail buildings in order to make Tanah Abang more amenable to the city's middle classes, who, it was thought, were scared away from shopping there due to the area's reputation.[93] In particular, Lunggana's Putra Perkasa security company was able to secure multiple contracts for the provision of security in nearly all of the main market buildings, as well as the areas surrounding the upmarket Plaza Indonesia shopping mall. Lunggana developed the concept of 'environment investment' ('*investasi lingkungan*'), by which businesses were asked to identify locals they considered reliable, who were then recruited and trained by the company.[94] Ucu's company Ucu Sinar Mas Pty was less successful as his reputation began to fade as did his health, and his networks reduced to a small group of loyalists.[95] While the ethnic and 'community' front of the IKBT had helped to consolidate the 'legitimacy' of new configurations of rackets in the context of contestations over turf amongst rival groups, this in turn intersected with the desire of the city's administration and businesses for more stable partners in the 'safeguarding' of the city.

In June 2001 Sutiyoso hosted a ceremony in the beachside theme park in Ancol in which he lit a huge papier mâché statue meant to symbolise preman. Replete with horns and eight arms holding knives, sickles and envelopes of cash, the statue was reported to be dressed in a tie and business shirt, leading one journalist to suggest to the governor that it looked more like a corrupt politician than your average street thug.[96] The symbolism of the burning preman was provocative considering the escalation in cases of violent vigilantism, public lynching and the burning of suspected petty criminals. In his

comments to the media at the ceremony, Sutiyoso asked the public not to take the law into their own hands, contradicting the symbolism of the burning preman and his earlier suggestion that they apprehend them themselves.[97] State-sanctioned 'culling' of preman à la Petrus was no longer an option in the new political climate, but 'street justice', conducted by citizens and 'empowered communities', offered a risky alternative. Violent vigilantism was not condoned by government, but it was 'understood'.

In order to deflect attention away from the failure of his administration to address the city's ongoing infrastructure problems, Sutiyoso followed the tradition of previous governors by blaming poor migrants for a host of problems, from flooding to crime and unemployment (Human Rights Watch 2006).[98] If migrant outsiders were to blame for the city's problems, then who better to assist in their removal than groups that claimed to represent Jakarta's indigenous population, a community which had long claimed to have been marginalised and disenfranchised by the process of urbanisation. Recently formed Betawi groups such as the Youth Generation Betawi Communication Forum (*Forum Komunikasi Generasi Muda Betawi* or FKGMB), as well as the IKBT, emerged as frontline supporters of the governor's revived public order campaign. For example, responding to the governor's drive to eliminate becak rickshaws from Tangerang and Bekasi, the coordinator of FKGMB stated that 'the existence of becak invites criminality', while warning NGOs not to 'politicise' the issue.[99] Like their 'nationalist' predecessors, they routinely made threats to NGOs critical of the administration.[100]

Outbreaks of violence between Madurese and Betawi gangs in other parts of the city had prompted discussions amongst Betawi figures close to the former regime, such as former deputy governor and architect of the Petrus operation Edi Nalapraya, former militia leader Irwan Sjafi'ie, and Major-General Nahrowi Ramli. According to Sjafi'ie, it was felt that a 'solution needed to be found for the Madurese problem', and that the support of Sutiyoso and big business for the IKBT combined with his anti-migrant rhetoric represented an opportunity for the Betawi, the marginalised indigenous population of Jakarta, to reclaim turf lost to other ethnic groups and consolidate its relationship with the administration.[101] Within a month of the preman burning ceremony, half a dozen more self-proclaimed Betawi groups had been established, the largest of which were the Betawi Communication Forum (*Forum Komunikasi Anak Betawi*, or *Forkabi*),[102] headed by Husien Sani, a property developer and advisory board member of the Jakarta Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Betawi Brotherhood Forum (*Forum Betawi Rempug*, or FBR), along with the Betawi Movement (*Gerak Betawi*), led by Abraham Lunggana.

Preman and the policing of public order

Sutiyoso's ploy was a risky one. His gestures to groups such as the IKBT opened the opportunity for consolidating the alliances with street-level

authority that he needed, but the stage upon which his strategies were played out was radically different. These groups refused to be compliant partners, making demands for facilities and a range of other economic and political concessions. They acted independently of government and police control, often employing violence and coercion in the name of safeguarding and protecting the integrity of Jakarta or their respective neighbourhoods, or on behalf of private clients with agendas frequently at odds with those of the administration.[103] The so-called 'delicate mechanism' of beking had been fundamentally altered.

As we shall see, this was further complicated by the introduction of decentralisation and regional autonomy laws in 2001. Fiscal and operational responsibility for health, education and public works was now in the hands of local government, increasing the imperative to establish its own sources of funding. Security was also delegated as a local government responsibility; however, the police, which gained institutional independence from the military in 2000, remained under national command. Sutiyoso was a vehement critic of this aspect of the laws, stating: 'we do not have the tools.'[104] Without direct control over the police, regional and district governments were required to develop alternative bodies for the enforcement of local ordinances and regulations, now a significant means for generating government revenue through the imposition of local taxes and levies. To fill this void Sutiyoso, along with regional governments nationwide, expanded the size and sphere of operations of civil servant police units such as Tramtib and the Civil Service Police Unit (*Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja*, or *Satpol PP*). Both had been in existence since the 1990s as local security units assigned to provincial governments, but decentralisation laws allowed district and regional governments to write their own ordinances regarding their use, and recruit new members (International Crisis Group 2003, 6).[105] The need for the Jakarta administration to rely upon forces such as Satpol PP saw significant increases in its funding.[106]

The primary task of Tramtib has been the enforcement of ordinance No.11 1988 Regarding Public Order. Revised in 2007, the ordinance is the principal means by which Jakarta's administration monitors and controls the informal street economy, giving it the power to evict residents and vendors deemed illegal, and monitor activities such as prostitution and gambling. The interface between policy implementation and the public, Tramtib has developed a reputation for being violent, brutal and corrupt.[107] According to Wardah Hafidz of the pro-poor NGO the Urban Poor Consortium (UPC), Tramtib's aggression has stemmed from the strict 'eviction targets' they are expected to achieve as well as an overall 'anti-poor' attitude, considered a reflection of government policy.[108] Fear of Tramtib looms even larger in the minds of vendors than harassment at the hands of preman. As one street vendor explained, 'if your stall just gets smashed up (by preman) that's not so bad, you can pick up the pieces and start again…but what are you to do if it's smashed up, all your assets are taken and you are arrested?'[109] For vendors,

Tramtib are in many respects the worst kind of preman, often competing with them in the extraction of protection fees alongside legal levies and fines.

In 2005–10 the Tramtib in Jakarta was headed by Harianto Badjoeri, a Jakarta leader of the PPM. During the New Order Badjoeri had served in the Tourism Office, the body directly responsible for the issuing of licences to pubs, clubs and other entertainment venues, a position that intersected profitably with his role in the PPM. The circumstances leading to his appointment illustrate the impact of territorial struggles upon local politics, and the extent to which the administration felt it necessary to attempt to form working alliances with those groups it considered potential partners in the task of bringing 'order' to Jakarta's streets. Badjoeri took Tramtib's top job after an incident involving Hercules. His gang had been involved in an ongoing string of incidents and clashes with both the administration and rival groups, including a bloody confrontation with the gang of Basri Sangaji in 2002, an Ambonese debt collector and former bodyguard of General Wiranto.[110] Hercules was initially a prime suspect after Basri's murder in 2004, before members of a gang led by another Ambonese debt collector, John Kei, were found guilty of the killing.[111] These conflicts, together with ongoing tensions with Madurese gangs, clashes between Betawi and Ambonese preman in Pulogadung, and the growth of gangs from Palembang, Flores and Medan in Blok M, Manggarai and Melawai, all helped to serve the interests of the expanding network of Betawi groups, reinforcing their argument that preman were by definition 'outsiders' and a criminal threat from which protection was needed.[112]

Since his expulsion from Tanah Abang in 1997, Hercules had initially focused upon debt collection and land brokering as his main sources of revenue.[113] In Jakarta's chaotic land tenure system it is not uncommon for there to be multiple tenure claims over a single piece of land. With the high cost of legal procedures, backlogs of cases in the courts and weak reconciliatory mechanisms, the contracting of preman to occupy contested land is a common practice. In 2005 Hercules's gang had been contracted to occupy land owned by Pertamina, the state-run oil company, in Rasuna Said, Kuningan, on behalf of local claimants. Conflict erupted when Tramtib came to remove the gang, resulting in Hercules's younger brother, John Albert, being fatally shot by a Tramtib officer.[114] Albert's death sparked violent retaliation, with Hercules's gang burning several Tramtib vehicles and threatening to take the body of the dead brother to the steps of City Hall. Betawi groups leapt to the defence of the administration with the FBR, Forkabi, IKBT and others 'protecting' the City Hall from a possible assault. When questioned by the media whether those guarding City Hall were also preman, Sutiyoso's response was: 'no they can't be [preman] because they are helping us keep the city safe. They are an asset to the state.'[115]

The shooting provoked widespread public controversy, less over the death of Albert and more as to why a Tramtib officer, considered by many as 'preman in uniform', carried a firearm. For street vendors in particular, who regularly come into physical conflict with Tramtib, the implications of the

shooting were terrifying.[116] Parliamentary fractions from the Islamist Prosperity and Justice Party (*Partai Keadilan Sejahtera*, or PKS), Golkar and PDI-P demanded that the head of Tramtib be held accountable for the shooting, and that the offending officer be charged.[117] Sutiyoso complied, replacing Tramtib's head Soebagyo with Harianto Badjoeri. Abraham Lunggana took over from Badjoeri as the Jakarta head of the PPM. Through his agency Tramtib recruited heavily from amongst the crop of Betawi gangs, partly as a response to allegations from the gangs themselves that they were underrepresented in comparison with other ethnic groups.[118] Betawi gangs have also became frequent partners in Tramtib raids against squatters, vendors and those in breach of public order ordinances, and have been invited to act as security at public events.[119] The 'indigenousness' of the Betawi served to legitimate the raids in a way that other gangs could not, creating a buffer between an unpopular administration and the public.

However, there have been numerous instances where these same groups have come into direct conflict with Tramtib. In Pondok Kelapa, for example, FBR and Forkabi sided with residents against Tramtib eviction raids.[120] Considering Schulte-Bockholt's 'crisis of hegemony' thesis, why would these groups resist offers of accommodation within government structures of domination such as Tramtib, especially those that could potentially further strengthen and legitimate their position in the streets? Despite efforts by Sutiyoso's administration to integrate and domesticate Betawi preman, they continued to view Tramtib and the administration more generally as challengers or threats to their local rackets and social sovereignty.

There are a number of reasons for this. First, alliances with government were strategic but no longer binding, as government itself was made vulnerable by electoral politics. The new Betawi groups were well aware of the 'looseness at the centre' and took advantage of this apparent weakness to increase their own social power. Second, with such deep-seated resentment towards the city's administration, especially amongst Jakarta's poor, in some instances the best way to consolidate local power and legitimise rackets was by adopting an oppositional stance. As we shall see in Chapter 5, the ideology of localism and indigenism was more than simply a mask for predatory self-interest. As much as these groups 'fed' from the informal economy and poor communities, they were also a part of them. By defending the community from a distrusted administration, they consolidated their place within it. Over time, as we shall see in proceeding chapters, this changed the shape and orientation of some of the organisations. Third, preman began to develop networks that were increasingly autonomous from government and state apparatus, including business and political parties. The growing market for their services afforded them power to negotiate on different terms, but also subjected them to competition. In this respect Tramtib along with the police were now just two amongst many interest groups attempting to establish forms of 'order' in Jakarta's streets – at times useful, at other times a hindrance to the interests of organised groups.

Conclusions

The changing of the preman guard in Tanah Abang precipitated broader shifts in the nature of preman-government alliances in Jakarta brought about by the collapse of the New Order. The removal of Hercules saw a change away from a vertical dependence upon powerful patrons, including the military, as groups and gangs sought to legitimise their rackets and territorial power via the invocation of indigenism and local identities. The need of the city's administration to foster local partners saw it extend a hand to these groups. The IKBT and Sutiyoso's administration both shared a vested interest in suppressing the emergence of counter-hegemonic forces and stemming the tide of the reform movement that could threaten their own local monopolies and rackets.

The Jakarta administration's public and private support of Tanah Abang and Betawi gangs and the reinvented jago tradition laid the foundations for a new organisational paradigm for the relationship between government and the informal authority represented by the jago. Drawing from strategies learnt during the New Order, Sutiyoso sought to integrate Betawi strongmen within state auxiliaries such as Tramtib and make concessions to their claims of privileged status as 'locals', while criminalising those such as Hercules who operated outside this paradigm. However, the fragmented nature of politics, the emergence of new social forces such as political parties, the opening up of under-regulated markets, together with the dynamics created by decentralisation in the city, all resulted in the balance of power in the streets shifting in favour of these networks of empowered preman. The situation that emerged was a kind of vicious circle whereby gang-related crime, or at least the fear of it, resulted in government campaigns which in turn recruited gangsters within the security apparatus while strengthening the position of organised groups able to adjust to the new forms of spatial power. Ultimately, government support aided these groups in consolidating themselves on two fronts: first, in giving legitimacy as representative groups dedicated to protecting the social and moral integrity of the kampung; and second, aiding their consolidation as private enterprises acting on behalf of clients. Backing from the city administration to survive and prosper was advantageous but no longer a necessity; the weakened administration, however, needed, or at least desired, to recuperate its territorial power.

Notes

1 For an insight into urban kampung life during this period, see Jellinek 1991.
2 Between 1966 to 1976 Jakarta's population grew from 3.6 to over 5.7 million (Abeyasakere 1987, 221).
3 Confidential interview with Tanah Abang vendor involved in efforts to unionise vendors during the 1980s, Jakarta, 2005.
4 In both instances the fire services arrived late and police stood by as locals frantically tried to put out the blaze themselves.

5 *Jakarta Post* (2000) 'Tanah Abang to have new look in five years', 31 May 2004, and 'Tanah Abang keeps its bad image', 5 August.
6 *Tempo* (2005) 'Tenabang, berubah dan berebut', 24 July.
7 For example, picking up or dropping off a taxi passenger can cost between Rp.1,000–2,000. Parking for 10 minutes can cost up to Rp.5,000–10,000, a significant dent in the already thin profit margins of taxi drivers. *Suara Merdeka*, 'Heboh rencana renovasi pasar Tanah Abang: pusat bertemunya pedagang, pembeli dan preman', 31 August 2004.
8 The nickname 'Hercules' was allegedly given to Rosario Marcal by Indonesian troops in East Timor due to his ability, despite his small frame, to lift and carry 100kg sacks of rice as part of his job guarding military supply warehouses. An Asia Watch report states that many Timorese were sent to a Kopassus-run training complex in Cijantung, where they were given military-style drill training before being placed in Jakarta factories. See Asia Watch, 'Deception and Harassment of East Timorese Workers', vol. 4, no. 16 (May 1992), at www.hrw.org/reports/pdfs/i/indonesa/indonesi925.pdf (accessed 14 May 2014).
9 *Forum Keadilan* (2000) 'Akhir kejayaan preman bertangan satu?' 25 June. A former gang member, Kobra, made a video clip with his rock band Kaka Band about this period. See www.youtube.com/watch?v=FUg4zbxz1ZI (accessed 10 July 2014).
10 Interview with Hercules, Jakarta, 2006.
11 Confidential interview, former gang member, Jakarta, 2006.
12 According to one account, Hercules was referred to Makarim by the Bishop of Dili, Carlos Ximenes Belo, who described him as neither pro-independence nor pro-integration, but simply a 'rioter'. *Investor Daily Indonesia* (2013) 'Zaky Anwar Makarim: Hercules, dari tukang masak, penjaga gudang hingga bos preman', 10 December. There are numerous rumours that Hercules saved Prabowo's life, and that this was the reason for their 'strong emotional bond'.
13 Interview with Hercules, Jakarta, 2006.
14 *Forum Keadilan*, 25 June 2000.
15 Confidential interviews with former associates of the gang, Jakarta, 2003. As one stated, 'nobody wants to become a preman, it happens out of necessity'. While Hercules himself maintained that pro-independence Timorese were 'extremists', his position was to change in later years, reflecting his experience with the New Order. In an interview in 2006 he expressed a desire to 'retire' to independent East Timor, adding that 'Australia and the international community care more about the welfare of East Timor than Indonesia ever did'. Interview with Hercules, Jakarta, 2006.
16 Confidential interviews, former gang members, Jakarta, 2005.
17 SPRIM document, www.xs4all.nl/~peace/pubeng/mov/movto/ekswil.html (accessed 15 May 2014).
18 Ibid. BAIS is the Armed Forces Strategic Intelligence Agency (*Badan Inteligen Strategis*), responsible for intelligence collection relating to external defence and internal security. According to O'Rourke (2002), the military overcame the labour shortage by bringing pro-integration militia members from East Timor to Jakarta, where they were used to intimidate pro-independence students and the family of former East Timor Governor Mario Carrascalao. Pemuda Pancasila was also deployed to hold demonstrations against Bishop Belo's 1996 Nobel Peace Prize.
19 After his expulsion from Tanah Abang in 1997, Kopassus agents pressured Hercules again to mobilise East Timorese in Jakarta in 1998. Unable to deliver, they brought in militias from East Timor.
20 *Gatra* (1998) 'Bentrok untuk Tanah Abang', 18 January. On top of this, vendors were also subject to fees and rents from local government and the police. Apart

from racketeering, Hercules's gang also operated gambling dens, specialising in *bola setan* ('devil ball') and was said to gain significant income from protecting prostitution close to the Tanah Abang train station.

21 Confidential interview, Tanah Abang vendor, Jakarta, 2003. Hercules and his gang were known to beat vendors savagely who resisted or were late with their payments.

22 Confidential interview, Tanah Abang resident, 2003. The 1995 attack by the Jatibunder gang was reportedly prompted by a split within Hercules's gang. Sensing Hercules's position was weakened by the split, the Jatibunder gang considered it an opportune moment to try to unseat him.

23 *Republika* (1997) 'Prabowo: preman paling takut pada saya', 27 January.

24 The reasons for the split are unclear, but one informant suggested that it was due to anger over what was considered to be Hercules's autocratic style of leadership.

25 Anis and his gang are reported to have attacked Hercules with machetes while he slept. They believed they had killed him, but while seriously injured, Hercules and his gang soon launched a retaliatory attack. Confidential interview, Jakarta, 2005.

26 *Republika* (1997) 'Ratusan pedagang kakilima Pasar Tanah Abang mengamuk', 27 January.

27 See *South China Morning Post* (1997) 'Capital hit by ethnic clashes as five jailed', 10 January; and *Wall Street Journal* (1997) 'Gang fighting disrupts Jakarta business district', 9 January.

28 *Wall Street Journal*, ibid.

29 It is tempting to speculate that Hercules was set up by the administration – ordered to instigate the violence and then becoming the fall guy, justifying his removal and replacement with a more amenable preman network.

30 *Jawa Pos* (1997) 'KSAD: Waspadai yang bermain dalam kasus itu', 28 January.

31 Tramtib was believed to be dominated by ethnic Batak throughout the 1990s, who also had their own gangs which dominated bus terminals such as Kampung Rambutan in East Jakarta prior to the ascendency of Betawi preman post-1998. A report in *Kompas* suggests that the riot was due to a 'lack of coordination between Hercules's gang and the deputy mayor. Despite already paying rent to Hercules vendors were then subjected to further rents and eviction by Tramtib. In anger they attacked the sub district office'. See *Kompas*, 'Preman menguasai Tanahabang', 2 February 1997.

32 *Banjarmasin Post*, 'Preman Tanah Abang gelar jumpa pers', 5 February 1997. In the press conference the gang insisted their presence at the front of the sub-district office was to protect it from an attack by Arnis's gang; however, the *Jawa Pos* reported that one gang member admitted that some of Hercules's gang may have been 'part of the crowd' that burnt the office down. *Jawa Pos*, 27 January 1997.

33 *Jawa Pos* (1997) 'Prabowo: Kopassus tak bekingi preman', 26 January.

34 Confidential interview, gang associate, Jakarta, 2003

35 Confidential interview, Jakarta, 2003. This included demonstrations to counter Bishop Belo's Nobel Peace Prize in 1996 and the appointment of a UN special envoy to East Timor in 1997.

36 Hercules became obsessed with preventing his name from being publicly identified with the world of preman. In 2004 he launched a defamation case against *Gatra* magazine for an article that referred to him as a 'former gangster', and his gang attacked the office of *Indo Pos* newspaper when it ran an article referring to him as the former 'King of the Preman' in Tanah Abang. Hercules lost the *Gatra* case and was charged and briefly imprisoned over the *Indo Pos* attack. He remained convinced that the DKI administration continued to conspire against him. Interview with Hercules, Jakarta, 2006.

37 These included some of the prominent textile barons in the area. Confidential interview, Jakarta, 2007.
38 Interview with local official, Tanah Abang, 2003.
39 *Tempo* (1998) 'Berjihad mendukung sidang', 30 November.
40 For more on the Pamswakarsa, see O'Rourke 2002,163.
41 Interview, Tanah Abang resident, 2003.
42 The IKBT was one of a number of ethnic-based 'Ikatan' associations to emerge during the late 1990s. Others included the Association of Central Moluccan Youth in Jakarta (*Ikatan Pemuda Maluku Tenggara di Jakarta*, or *AmKey*), led by notorious gangster John Kei, and the Family of Madura Association (*Ikatan keluarga Madura*, or *Ikamra*).
43 He is still often called Bang Ucu Kambing, *kambing* being the Indonesian word for goat.
44 Sabeni is said to be an abbreviation of *sabet kompeni*, 'whip the company', in reference to Haji Sabeni and his students' violent opposition to Dutch colonial rule. Haji Sabeni's relatives continue to teach his form of pencak silat in Tanah Abang.
45 Interview with Abraham Lunggana, Jakarta, December 2007.
46 Interview with Bang Ucu, Jakarta, 2005. He insists that the title was given to him by Tanah Abang locals as a mandate to act on their behalf.
47 *Gatra* (2005) 'Hidup layak berkat nyali', 13 June. A three-star general, Ryamizard Ryacudu was Pangdam Jaya until 2001.
48 Ibid. Rumours suggest this may have been property tycoon Tomy Winata, who was to become a major player in Tanah Abang; however, Ucu vehemently denies this. In 1975 Ucu first met Yapto Some of Pemuda Pancasila, who left him with a permanent scar to his head after striking him with a machete. Despite this 'bad start', the two are said to have become good friends, although Ucu's formal association with PP ended in the late 1980s.
49 As a result, Ucu confined his services to 'anything, except gambling, selling drugs or women'. Interview with Bang Ucu, Jakarta, 2005.
50 Interview with Bang Ucu, Jakarta, 2005.
51 Ibid.
52 Ibid.
53 Interview, former Jatibaru gang members, Jakarta, 2005.
54 This chronology of events is constructed from an alleged eye-witness account that was posted on the Indonesia-l internet mailing list, and later removed. This has been cross-checked by interviews with several witnesses of the events, including a member of Hercules's gang. Those interviewed requested complete anonymity.
55 Interview, Tanah Abang resident, 2006. According to one eye-witness account the attackers yelled 'Allahu akbar, kill all the East Timorese!' At the time of the assault Kodam Jaya's commander was Major-General Syafri Syamsuddin, a close confidant of Prabowo, suggesting his complicity, or at least in the removal of Hercules.
56 In 2001 Hercules and his supporters staged a sit-in at the Office of the Mayor of Central Jakarta demanding compensation for the destruction of their headquarters. The mayor's office rejected the claim, saying the warehouse was built upon government land, and local Betawi groups threatened a possible 'massacre' if Hercules and his supporters caused trouble. *Sinar Harapan* (2001) 'Warga Betawi siap hadapi Hercules', 21 July.
57 Others are said to have been bound and forcibly removed by the military on the orders of Major-General Syafri Syamsuddin and sent to Ragunan and the Miniature Indonesia theme park (Taman Mini).
58 Interview with Abraham Lunggana, Tanah Abang, July 2007.

59 *Kompas* (2000) 'Tanah Abang, emang abang yang punye?' 29 June.
60 The anti-drugs stance of the IKBT eventually brought it into conflict with some local police who were rumoured to receive payoffs from drug dealers based in Kampung Bali. It was only with the support of marines, through Lunggana's PPM networks, that the IKBT was able to remove them from the area. Confidential interview, Jakarta, 2006.
61 *Kompas* (2000) 'Preman Tanah Abang aktif lagi', 28 August. The Matrik guards were unique to Tanah Abang and operated alongside the largely dysfunctional siskamling system.
62 Interview with Abraham Lunggana, Jakarta, December 2007.
63 Confidential interview, Tanah Abang resident, Jakarta, 2005.
64 *Kompas* (1999) 'Daerah perebtuan para preman', 28 June.
65 Ibid. Abraham Lunggana contends that the tensions were fuelled by business interests from rival market areas such as Mannga Dua and Cempaka Mas, in the hope that such unrest would result in increased business for them. Interview, Abraham Lunggana, Jakarta, December 2007.
66 *Kompas* (1999) 'Kawasan Tanahabang diliputi ketegangan', 28 June.
67 Ibid. Another version suggests that the spark that ignited the violence came when a member of the Jatibunder group began protecting a gambling den 'far too close' to one already being operated by the Jatibaru gang. Confidential interview, Tanah Abang, 2005.
68 *Kompas* (1999) 'Kawasan Tanahabang diliputi ketegangan', 28 June.
69 Confidential interviews, IKBT members, Jakarta, 2005. This was reportedly done via the distribution of leaflets and posters as well as in sermons by local preachers at mosques throughout the district.
70 Confidential interview, Tanah Abang resident, 2003. While prostitution was considered morally corrupting, racketeering was not.
71 *Liputan6* (2001) 'Premanisme masih menghantui Polisi', 19 February.
72 For example, the outbreaks of communal violence in West and Central Kalimantan, Poso in Sulawesi, and Ambon. See Klinken 2007.
73 Governor Sutiyoso, statement in meeting with Second Commissioner of the Indonesian Legislative Council and the Sub-Commissioner for Law and Human Rights, 7 February 2002, quoted in Human Rights Watch 2006.
74 *Jakarta Post* (1999) 'Hoodlums told to find a better profession', 30 June.
75 For a comprehensive report on forced evictions and the administration's harassment of marginal communities in Jakarta, see the report by Human Rights Watch 2006.
76 According to Sutiyoso himself, from 1997 to 2002, 4,538 protests were staged against him. *Jakarta Post* (2002) 'Sutiyoso: most maligned governor?' 16 July.
77 Earlier in 1997 minivan drivers had also protested after being forced by preman to buy 'Mikrolet Driver Association' stickers. See *Kompas* (2000) 'Tanah Abang, emang abang yang punye?' 29 June.
78 *Jakarta Post* (2000) 'Minivan drivers go on Strike over illegal levy', 27 June.
79 Other groups involved included the Ikhwutan Sunnah Waljamaah and the PP. For more on the AAK, see Asgart 2003.
80 *Tempo* (2001) 'Anti komunisme semu', 20 May.
81 Interview with Bang Ucu, Jakarta, 2005. The IKBT also targeted left-wing political parties and activist networks such as the PRD. The AAK also threatened to destroy a statue depicting a farmer couple on the grounds that it was a symbol of the PKI. *Jakarta Post* (2001) 'Betawi people told not to destroy statue of farmers', 9 May.
82 Confidential interview, Jakarta labour activist and Urban Poor Consortium activists, 2003. During the 2001 May Day celebrations, Ucu and fellow IKBT members confronted and reportedly assaulted Budiman Sudjatmiko, chairperson of the PRD.

83 *Tempo* (2001) 'IKBT bantah dibiayi Golkar', 9 May.
84 *Bangsaku.com* (2001) 'Bang Ucu Sabeni, Jawara Betawi Minta pendukung Gus Dur pulang: kalo Aparat kagak bisa ngusir dalam waktu 2 x 24 jam, kite yang usir', 17 March.
85 *Tempo* (2001) 'Anti komunisme semu', 20 May. According to police, in the first two months of 2001 the crime rate increased by 70%.
86 *Detik* (2001) 'Preman Jakarta kabarmu kini: proyek Rp 12 miliar basmi preman Jakarta', 19 April.
87 *Tempo* (2001) 'Sutiyoso bakar patung preman di Ancol', 24 June.
88 Kompas (2001) 'IKBT tangani program percontohan pembinaan preman', 11 May.
89 *Tempo* (2001) 'Crackdown on hoodlums: scratching the surface', 30 April.
90 *Detik* (2001) 'Preman Jakarta kabarmu kini: proyek Rp 12 miliar basmi preman Jakarta', 19 April. According to a survey conducted by *Tempo* in May 2001, 50.3% of respondents considered the campaign a serious attempt to deal with preman crime, while 49.7% considered it a way of using up government funds. *Tempo*, 20 May 2001.
91 As one vendor at the time stated, 'it's the police that extort us, are they included amongst the preman to be gotten rid of?' *Detik* (2001) 'Biayanya milyaran, hasilnya diragukan', 19 April. All of the Jakarta anti-preman campaigns since 2001 have been marked by an increase in public complaints against the police, especially in relation to extortion and rent seeking.
92 On this association between tattoos and criminality, see Barker 1998.
93 Interview with Abraham Lunggana, Jakarta, 2007.
94 To be recruited a candidate must not have an extensive criminal record, or a history of involvement with narcotics or gambling.
95 Tensions between Ucu and Lunggana were exacerbated by a fire in 2003 which destroyed the main market building in Tanah Abang, rumoured to have been linked to a bid by Tommy Winata to gain a tender to renovate the main market block. After a report in *Tempo* suggesting that Winata stood to gain from the fire, he launched a successful libel case against the magazine, after sending thugs who beat up several *Tempo* staff, including its editor. See *Pontianak Post* (2003) 'Masa Tommy Winata serbu Tempo', 9 March.
96 *Tempo* (2001) 'Sutiyoso bakar patung preman di Ancol', 24 June.
97 Ibid.
98 According to the Jakarta Population and Civil Registration Agency, approximately 190,000 people move to Jakarta each year, around 10% of them arriving after religious holidays. *Jakarta Post* (2006) 'Experts deplore city's decision to ban newcomers', 23 October.
99 *Tempo* (2001) 'Warga Betawi bantah dimobilisasi Pemda', 4 August.
100 *Jakarta Post* (2001) 'Thousands protest public order raids', 20 July. Interview with Wardah Hafiz, coordinator of the Urban Poor Consortium, Jakarta, 2003.
101 Interview with Irwan Sjafi'ie, Jakarta, 2005.
102 According to Irwan, the 'hidden' meaning of Forkabi was 'for smashing', combining the English 'for' with '*kabi*', a Betawi slang term for 'smash' or beat up.
103 In particular in land title disputes where the groups would often side with 'Betawi' residents over those of developers or government.
104 *Jakarta Post* (2000) 'Sutiyoso wants city police under his power', 27 September.
105 In 2001–04 Tramtib personnel increased from 9,000 to over 15,000. Interview with Harianto Badjoeri, Jakarta, 2005.
106 *Kompas* (2003) 'Anggaran Tramtib Rp 139 Miliar dinilai terlalu besar', 13 May. By 2007 this had been increased to Rp.303 billion. *Sinar Harapan* (2007) 'Anggaran Tramtib dipertanyakan', 13 May.

107 See for example, *Rakyat Merdeka* (2007) 'Operasi petugas Tramtib DKI makan korban', 6 December.
108 *Forum Keadilan* (2005) 'Wardah Hafidz: Tramtib itu dibubarkan Saja', no. 44, 13 March. This attitude is summed up in the words of Badjoeri: 'discipline (of street vendors) is not something you can ask nicely of someone…oh can you please be disciplined, do this do that and so on…no, it needs to be done with force.' Interview with Harianto Badjoeri, Jakarta, 2003.
109 Interview with street vendor, Pasar Minggu, Jakarta, 2006.
110 *Koran Tempo* (2002) 'Saya kejar sampai mati, 11 May.
111 *Jakarta Post* (2004) 'Basri Murder a case of Revenge', 21 October. Basri and John Kei's gangs had clashed two months earlier, resulting in a number of fatalities.
112 See *Tempo* (2004) 'Tawuran antar etnis, tiga luka', 7 July.
113 Later, he invested in a number of legal business enterprises, such as fishing, farming, a management and English college close to Tanah Abang, and a hotel in Dili, East Timor.
114 *Detik* (2005) 'Hercules tuding Dinas Tramtib DKI diperalat Perusahaan Hitam', 22 February.
115 *Detik* (2005) 'Diancam Hercules, Sutiyoso ajak lawan preman', 18 February.
116 Interview with UPC activists, Jakarta, 2005. According to Tramtib regulations, commanding officers are legally entitled to carry a firearm, and use it when physically threatened.
117 *Tempo* (2005) 'Anggotta DPR jenguk Crisman Siregar', 21 February.
118 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2006. Badjoeri was dismissed in 2010 in the wake of riots in Koja, Tanjung Priok provoked by Satpol PP's violent clearance of land surrounding the shrine of a local Muslim leader, which left three dead and over 200 injured. The incident resulted in a widespread backlash against Satpol PP, with hundreds of officers abandoning their uniforms out of fear of reprisals. FBR members featured prominently in the riots on the side of local residents. Subsequently it officially adopted a 'softer' approach, with Badjoeri replaced by a former mayor of North Jakarta, Effendi Anas. After 2012, under the administration of Governor Joko Widodo, Satpol PP was subjected to greater oversight and 'disarmed' in the interests of reforming its image.
119 See for example *Kompas* (2005) 'Kawasan Senen tegang akibat aksi ribuan pedagang', 26 July; *Koran Tempo* (2006) 'Lahan kosong, siapa mau jaga?' 6 May; and *Tempo* (2003) 'Polres Jakarta Timur diserbu FBR', 3 October.
120 *Kompas* (2003) 'FBR bentrok dengan petugas Tramtib, dua luka', 2 October. The gradual shift of the FBR away from aggressively defending the interests of the governor and towards becoming a more outspoken advocate of the rights of the urban poor will be discussed in Chapter 6.

5 The rise of the Betawi

> The purpose of the FBR is to act as a vehicle through which to struggle for the rights of the Betawi community, which till now have been oppressed, both structurally as well as culturally, in order that they may become 'the real owner of the island' and *jawara* in their own neighbourhood.
>
> (Forum Betawi Rempug 2002)

The rapid social and political change following the end of Suharto's rule and the emergence of new markets precipitated a proliferation in the number of violent entrepreneurs. Freed from the constraints of acquiescence to state ideology and interests, ethnicity, religion and local identity emerged as organisational poles for preman and other violent entrepreneur groups. This was by no means confined to Jakarta, though it was here that it took one of its more intriguing forms. Following on from the description of the changing of the preman guard in Tanah Abang between 1997 to 2002, this chapter charts the shift towards ethnicity and localism as the bases for demarcating and legitimising territorial protection monopolies in Jakarta through an examination of the rise of groups claiming to represent the Betawi, often identified as the 'indigenous' population of the capital. Emerging as part of a broader nationwide politicisation of ethnic identity as an outcome of decentralisation and regional autonomy reforms, groups such as the Forum Betawi Rempug (FBR) and Forkabi drew upon local legends of social bandits such as Si Pitung, constructing themselves as legitimate defenders of an indigenous homeland with exclusivist rights to 'protect', police and tax.

The FBR, the largest organisation of this type in Jakarta, has articulated a critique of the state in which the Betawi have failed to benefit from either the economic development of the New Order or the process of democratisation following its demise. Representing themselves as a vehicle for the powerless and neglected in the face of a corrupt and ineffectual government, rackets, vigilantism and coercive extraction of rents are justified as a collectivist ethnic right. The FBR has not denied its roots in the world of preman, *but* posits itself as representative of the preman as a social underclass, providing moral guidance and an opportunity to 'fill their stomach'.[1] The claim is that these are the downtrodden victims of what the group's founder called the 'real

preman', those 'wearing ties, preman wearing uniforms, those in the executive or the legislature, in the police and army'.[2] This critical stance has not prevented the FBR, however, from entering into alliances with political elites and parties in order to exert leverage and in some instances gain positions within various tiers of the city's administrative and governance structure. The rationale behind any such arrangement was that it must contribute to the organisation's objectives of improving the material welfare of its members, and by extension that of the 'Betawi'. Over time, its ability to provide 'protection' (in an extractive, defensive and 'moral' sense), extend its territorial network, and offer forms of social welfare and advocacy has seen the FBR and groups like it grow in size and influence, gaining recognition from government and becoming a significant presence throughout the city. As Simone explains, the ability of the preman to 'cross borders' has traditionally been a source of their power, insofar as they embody not only the aspirations of residents to operate beyond the space of the kampung, 'but the capacity to do so' (Simone 2010, 78). In this respect mass organisations such as the FBR which have attempted to institutionalise this arrangement have positioned themselves as an important form of mediation between kampung and the state (Simone 2010, 77).

The FBR shares similarities with New Order organisations like the Pemuda Pancasila, yet is different in a number of key ways that are more broadly indicative of the post-authoritarian context in which they've emerged. First, it identifies as a popular representative organisation in opposition to the state and 'elites', rather than as a government or party loyalist. It has retained organisational independence, and utilises a combination of grass-roots organisation, advocacy and shrewd political manoeuvring to push its agendas. Second, over the past decade it has transformed from its beginnings in inter-gang conflict and street-level turf wars into an organisation with a mass support base and city-wide network that extends well beyond the world of preman and criminality with which it is commonly associated. Third, as will be argued, the FBR reflects a particular type of populist political agency of the urban poor and working class shaped by the dynamics of democratic transition, while still informed by the logics of turf politics normalised during the New Order. This agency, albeit in a form that has largely remained invisible to liberal and structuralist commentators alike, has manifested on a number of fronts: the seeking of concessions and redistribution through engaging in electoral populism and strategic alliances with elites, developing effective self-help networks and infrastructure, defending communities from encroachment or eviction, and consolidating forms of non-state 'social sovereignty'.[3]

Decentralisation: new playing field, same game

Before we examine in greater detail the rise to prominence of Betawi gangs and mass organisations, it is first necessary to consider briefly the broader social and political context of decentralisation, and the kinds of realignments and types of competition that accompanied it. Regional autonomy laws first

implemented in 2001 had an immediate effect of reinvigorating local and regional politics, and subsequently raising the stakes for struggles over control of local resources. The decentralised system of local government was, according to many of those who championed it, a supposed 'answer' to the patrimonial and centralist system of the New Order that would bring some form of 'good governance' characterised by transparency and accountability. Significant degrees of political power and fiscal authority were transferred to the municipal (*kotamadya*) and district (*kabupaten*) levels at the expense of provincial and national levels of government. Direct elections for local government heads were established, the first being held in 2005. What had previously been considered rubber-stamp positions within the administrative hierarchy or local legislatures now offered greater opportunities for the direct accumulation and redistribution of resources and the power to prevent others from doing so, but were also open to a greater number of players. Former elites from various rungs of the New Order ladder were well positioned and practised to dominate this process and many did so, as has been amply documented, but not without intense levels of competition amongst themselves together with an array of new actors (Hadiz and Robison 2004, Buehler 2007). Buehler has argued that the new institutional environment essentially 'reshuffled the cards for political elites' (Buehler 2007, 119) and that particularly in local district head elections (*Pemilihan kepala daerah*, or *Pilkada*) those with extensive personal networks at the sub-district level were better placed to do well.

The shifting of territorial boundaries, intense inter-elite competition emerging from electoral democracy and the break-up of established patronage networks saw, initially, outbreaks of communal conflict throughout the country (Klinken 2007). This break-up was in some respects quite literal as governmental, administrative district and provincial boundaries were being redefined as part of the implementation of regional autonomy reforms. New provinces and districts came into existence via territorial splits, a process known as *pemekaran* or 'blossoming'. As local government and administrative boundaries were altered, 'local selfishness' was reinforced, resulting in conflicts and tensions at the local level (Firman 2013, 180). Just like national politics, local-level politics was an intense 'arena of contestation between competing coalitions of social interests' as networks that had relied upon central state patronage or been regime middlemen moved to establish new means to access resources (Hadiz 2011a, 171).

This contestation involved renegotiating the boundaries of collective identities, in doing so defining a social economy of who had access to what, and under what circumstances. According to Klinken, from 1998 local elites throughout the country attempted to build 'an exclusive discourse of ethnicity', one that in its construction of group identity formed a 'language with which elites compete for power by mobilising supporters' (Klinken 2002, 68). This played out in establishing the parameters of 'one's own', something preman have long been adept at doing at the local level. Conflicts or violence

in which ethnic or local identity is highlighted have routinely been used by preman, in the words of Simone, 'so as to emphasize the fact that such differences may have important implications in terms of how residents are linked to the larger city, especially in terms of the kinds of authorities and powerful figures they have access to' (Simone 2010, 79). In the context of socially heterogeneous neighbourhoods in Jakarta where access to resources, space and income is a source of constant tension and insecurity, this 'power of localising' has been used by groups and rackets to pursue 'collective interests against the interests of the whole' (Horkheimer, as cited in Schulte-Bockholt 2013, 74).

The rise of self-conscious localism and ethnicity as the organisational basis for rackets, similar to that seen in Tanah Abang, was occurring in many parts of the country. While a plethora of new groups came into existence, older networks adopted new ideological garb. In West Java, for example, the New Order-period Angkatan Muda Siliwangi distanced themselves from their military roots, now emphasising a role as 'defenders' of Sundanese culture. In the new province of Banten, the Golkar-affiliated Pendekar Banten under the leadership of Hasan Sochib further consolidated their 'rightful' monopolisation over the region's political and economic life as 'native sons' (*putera daerah*), culminating in Sochib's daughter Ratu Atut securing the governorship in 2007. In Bali, *Pecalang* (traditional security guards) and an array of ethnic militias emerged as reinvented forms of quasi-official 'traditional security' that has established a place in the political, economic and cultural life of the island. Pam Swakarsa vigilante groups and criminal networks in Lombok grew in size and political prominence (MacDougall 2007), while Dayak and Malay militias in Kalimantan and a host of other ethnicised entrepreneurs in violence sprung up throughout the country (Klinken 2007). Various religious militias and vigilante groups such as the Front Pembela Islam also came to prominence, claiming a mandate to protect local Muslim communities from the licentiousness, moral decay and 'excessive freedom' that they believed had accompanied the post-authoritarian transition (Wilson 2008). As one FPI leader explained, 'democratic reform opened the door for change, the problem however is that just about anyone or anything has been able to walk through that door…pornographers, homosexuals, apostates, all manner of heresy and deviancy'.[4]

While operating with relative autonomy, their existence was fed and in many cases subsidised by the needs of local political elites and the military and police to consolidate and renegotiate their own power and interests in a more unpredictable and competitive political environment. Local preman were a ready supply of muscle for mobilising electoral support, sources of revenue and had the ability to maintain conducive forms of local order, in many respects a continuation of their previous role during the regime. As Hadiz and Ryter have shown, political gangsters who had formed part of the middle and lower echelons of the New Order's power structure now had 'their moment in the sun'. If, as Ryter states, turf wars of the New Order were 'limited to competition within the framework of a single party capped by a

single boss', decentralisation and competitive democracy meant these struggles 'could now be waged more openly and with much greater opportunities' (Ryter 2012, 112). The outcomes of this dynamic have played out in specific ways shaped by local contingencies and at different levels; however, there are a number of general points worth consideration. The 'individualisation' of local politics referred to by Buehler elevated the power of prominent local figures with extensive grass-roots networks (Buehler 2007). Ryter has documented, for example, how bosses with New Order 'youth organisation' backgrounds have had great success in gaining seats in regional parliaments, generally with higher overall percentages of votes than officials or business people (Ryter 2012, 191–92). Local bosses and strongmen, in this respect, have benefited from democratisation. However, they have not been immune to its broader contours and dynamics, including greater expectations by the rank and file of representation and material improvement. In many cases this has translated into familiar patterns of resource distribution and concessions, but in a number of groups that have emerged in the post-New Order context, such as the FBR, collectivist aspirations and demands for resolutions to the structural problems in which members are immersed find reflection in the group's core objectives.

Vehicle of the underclass

The appeal or utility value of ethnicised mass organisations was not confined then to political gangsters, local bosses or politicians seeking to seize territory and realise ambitions for power and upward mobility. It also extended to social and economic classes such as the poor and working class, seeking organisational vehicles to improve their material conditions, assert an invigorated sense of rights to the city and make gains in competition for space and markets. These were not just masses reducible to muscle to be mobilised on call in return for '*sesuap nasi*' (a scoop of rice), or those seeking an organisational cover for criminality. For example, from this crop of new mass organisations there have been demands for formal and 'legitimate' employment, security of tenure for urban kampung in a city in which the majority of the poor live with an ever-present threat of eviction, the provision of basic public infrastructure such as drainage and sanitation, and demands for their representation and realisation.[5] They have engaged in protests in defence of elite patrons 'on demand', and intimidated other social movements, but also been advocates on issues of immediate consequence to their members and the neighbourhoods in which they live.[6] In a more fluid, decentralised sociopolitical context, the 'masses' are also a constituency which can and does shape the strategies and orientation of the organisations it forms and joins. In other words, as social actors, gang and ormas members have shown the capacity to act in the interests of their communities, but also not to do so.

This dimension of gangs, mass organisations and militias is often overlooked or dismissed in studies of contemporary Indonesia, which generally

categorises them as manifestations of criminality, the subcontracted violent defenders of the interests of political and economic elites or predatory manifestations of 'uncivil society' (Hadiz 2003, 607). While these characterisations are not without a degree of truth, each fails to account for or critically examine fully the complexity and altered dynamics of the post-1998 period in terms of how these have been translated into organisational and survival strategies on the part of those joining, rather than only those of bosses. As Aspinall has noted, the apparent absence of forms of popular agency in Indonesia mirroring those in Europe or Latin America has created a blind spot amongst many analysts for other forms of political agency, organisation and mobilisation on the part of the subaltern (Aspinall 2013). Far from being static entities, gangs as social actors respond to the material, social and political constraints in which they are immersed in a variety of often contradictory ways. Gang activity or involvement, and by extension the kind of street-based organisations found in Jakarta, can in this respect be seen as an expression of and vehicle for the struggles of the urban underclasses (Dichiara and Chabot 2003, 79) – a means for seeking redress for perceived injustice and socioeconomic marginalisation and as modes of local governance in lieu of, in conjunction with or running parallel to state governance. As Barker has noted, it is the ability of jago and preman to organise 'the most politically volatile and publicly visible members of the informal proletariat' that has attracted the interest of state authorities and political parties (Barker 2009, 72).

Gangs are, despite prevailing stereotypes, multifaceted forms of social organisation, and Indonesia is no different in this respect. The loosening and fragmenting of the patrimonial structures linking gangs to state power has created space to articulate and define new social and political agendas. Brotherton's work on the transformation of organised gangs in the USA towards what he describes as 'street organizations', 'the transitional stage between a gang and a social movement', offers a framework for understanding how gangs, vigilante groups or ethnicised militias can be sources of criminality, while also acting as vehicles for proactive social and cultural resistance by politically and socially marginal communities (Brotherton 2007, 252). In areas such as Bekasi, which is home to some of the largest industrial and manufacturing estates in the region, the membership of the FBR and a range of other post-New Order mass organisations is made up almost entirely of those outside the constituency of a growing and increasingly well organised trade union movement.[7] The unemployed, petty traders, informal sector workers such as street vendors and *ojek*, and part-time and career preman, have turned to the FBR and similar groups in the relative absence of alternative organisational vehicles to defend or assert notions of collective interest, identity and rights. While local informal economies are able to work primarily by the ways in which different individual activities, skills and resources complement each other, the range of trade-offs does not translate well in terms of the types of consensual participation often valorised in urban social movements. Sectoral consciousness is also difficult to foster in environments of

diversified income-generating activities and workplaces where socioeconomic and political life is primarily territorially based, such as the neighbourhood or street (Simone 2010). Subsequently, there is a much higher consciousness and sensitivity to issues of space and access to the opportunities it affords, which can intersect with constructions of identity. The complex sets of relationships and interactions amongst heterogeneous groups of people that make up the everyday patterns of social and informal economic life in Jakarta's urban kampung often submerge ethnicity, religion and other identities and affiliations, but these can be brought to the forefront, including through violence, as a means by which to reconfigure and redefine rights.

The view of these gangs or ormas as criminal, socially disruptive or predatory is one not necessarily shared by the neighbourhoods in which they are based and which they often claim to represent and 'protect'. A survey of several districts in Jakarta with significant gang presence conducted by Anderson and Snyder, for example, found that they were generally seen by residents in a positive light, or met with ambivalence. The main reasons given were that they helped provide protection and a more general sense of security (from neighbouring gangs), and were of assistance during community rituals (weddings, funerals, etc.) or during times of crisis such as floods (Anderson and Snyder 2013). In lieu of adequate state services, organised gangs are often community benefactors of varying degrees, commanding a loyalty or at least respect which frequently confounds and frustrates both law enforcement agencies and developmentalist NGOs.[8] This of course would vary considerably dependent upon local conditions, but the general point remains. In interview, many gang members cited 'protection' of their kampung as a central reason for involvement. The threats from which protection was ostensibly required included crime, rival groups often associated with migrants, 'outsiders' competing for space, jobs and informal markets, outbreaks of social conflict and broader structural processes such as economic inequality. The perception of 'moral crisis' and an increasing 'criminal threat' post-1998 was also widely felt throughout the city, fed in part by an upsurge in media coverage given to violent crime which in some respects mirrored that of the pre-Petrus period (Bertrand 2010, 88). In poor neighbourhoods this has often played in favour of groups such as the FBR and FPI, which present themselves as legitimate community-based providers of protection against criminality (Wilson 2014).

The provision of protection, when viewed in isolation, can readily appear as criminal extortion: the coercive extraction with no pretence of offering a service in return. However, the concept of protection, as Volkov suggests, 'implies a multiplicity of interacting wielders of force, each of whom can simultaneously act as a threat and as a protection' (Volkov 2002, 35). It is only when other coercive or threatening forces are situated in relation to one another that protection becomes 'real'. That the police were commonly seen by kampung residents as corrupt, ineffective or criminal themselves strengthened the position of those who could mediate and broker between them and

the kampung, or who offered more cost-effective and accountable forms of justice and dispute resolution. This contrasted with the city's middle class for whom these groups and the poor more generally are frequently caste as a source of crime and violence against which protection and greater law enforcement is needed.[9] As we shall see, what appeared as more straightforward cases of extortion conducted by the group targeted those defined as 'outsiders' or 'economic predators'.[10] The current leader of the FBR, Lutfi Hakim, gave the following explanation as to the entrenched view of his organisation as 'criminal':

> The perceptions of us as essentially 'anarchist' and inherently criminal in intent is a typical middle-class and media judgement of any kind of grassroots kampung-based organisation. They fail through ignorance, or perhaps fear, to see the important good works we do and the importance of solidarity and mutual assistance networks for the poor who join, which is why they do so in large numbers. Sure there are rough types within the FBR; it's a reflection of the world in which we live. But put it in perspective, it's nothing on the scale of what you see in state institutions such as the military, parliament or political parties. Anyway, the rough also have a right to improve their lives and secure a future. If *reformasi* wasn't about that, then what was it?[11]

Decentred centre

In Jakarta, the impact of decentralisation and regional autonomy reforms rolled out throughout the country from 2001 were not immediately apparent, due in part to its status as the nation's capital. The proximity to national elites has always relegated the profile of local political struggles in the city to a subscript or extension of national ones, evident in the relative absence of literature examining its post-New Order politics. Jakarta has historically been situated as the site of 'the national', not the 'local'; the powerful centre against which regional autonomy and decentralisation was defined. Calls for greater autonomy, rights and access to material resources from Jakarta's residents necessitated in this respect a separation of city and 'nation', a dismantling of the 'nationalist urbanism' that Kusno argues has dominated the governance of the city since independence (Kusno 2010, 31). This linked the urban governance of the city to the power of Jakarta as the seat of national power and prestige, so that 'if a kampung had to be demolished and the master plan changed, the further development of the nation provides sufficient justification' (Kusno 2010, 25). The economic collapse of 1997 followed by the riots of 1998 surrounding Suharto's downfall effectively did this. The regime that had loomed so powerful for 32 years came to a relatively abrupt end, in part as an outcome of protests and demonstrations by a diverse coalition of social groups in Jakarta's streets. A new critical consciousness and scepticism towards government took hold, combined with a lingering anxiety

and trauma over the riots of May 1998 and violence that followed, in the wake of which over 1,500 were dead and sections of the city looted and burned to the ground. There was also awareness that government could not guarantee any kind of protection, and that the city was 'insecure'. Economic hardship saw large influxes of people into the city from the peri-urban periphery due to massive job losses in the manufacturing sector (Firman 1999, 456). Many took to the streets to generate a livelihood jostling alongside existing residents, with a huge increase in the numbers of vendors, street-side stalls (*warung*), beggars, *ojek* and informal traffic and parking wardens. Squatter communities also proliferated and expanded, occupying any available land.

Despite the very different socio-political climate, Sutiyoso continued to attempt to govern Jakarta using heavy-handed practices developed within the institutional framework of the authoritarian New Order. He responded to this 'colonising' of city space by ordering mass evictions and criminalising unskilled migrants, leaving thousands homeless.[12] Offers from the central government to take part in a project to build 200,000 low-cost houses for the poor were rejected in favour of expensive beautification projects and public monuments (Nurbianto 2003). Such an approach may have been equally unpopular during the New Order, but was met with relatively little resistance. Now, however, the poor and informal proletariat were assertive of their rights to a place in the city, and resistance and protest were frequent. During Sutiyoso's first term as governor (1997–2002) there had been, at his own estimate, 4,538 demonstrations staged against him (Kusno 2010, 38). In turn, the problems of Jakarta were increasingly framed by the administration as caused by migrant outsiders, 'non-citizens' who showed little regard for law, property or government authority (Harsanto 2005).[13]

Struggles over the use and 'ownership' of the streets of the capital between various social and economic classes, identity groups, the city administration, developers, business and a range of social and political forces intensified (Firman 1999). National identity as an instrument to create links between different types of power towards the governance of the city had lost its legitimacy. This impacted significantly in Jakarta upon the influence and membership base of organisations such as the PP, which had staked its reputation on identification with and loyalty to the idea of the unitary republic and its institutional manifestation in the New Order corporatist state. As one Tanah Abang preman quipped to me in 2005 when I asked why he joined an Islamist vigilante group, 'now in the *reformasi* era, nationalism, "defending the state" and all that shit just doesn't cut it anymore'.[14] Here indigeneity is a manifestation of territorial localism, combined with a critical consciousness towards the authority of the post-New Order state. The 'local' became the focus of political discourse and agency, a model that overlapped with the territorial power of preman, which was itself undergoing transformation, and the struggles for the right to a secure place in the city by the poor and working class. The emergence then post-2002 of groups that claimed rights to jobs,

resources *and* the right to monopolise the provision of protection and security as the 'real owners' of Jakarta, represented an 'end point' of decentralisation, insofar as the geographical and symbolic centre of state power was itself 'decentred'. The city's elites, as will be detailed in Chapter 6, attempted to co-opt this towards the task of regaining some measure of control over Jakarta's streets, and re-establishing networks and working relationships with informal leaders, local strongmen and the communities over whom they held influence. 'Betawi' became a powerful mobilising identity. Yet many of those who identified as Betawi had a long and bitter experience of marginalisation as an outcome of Jakarta's nationalist urbanism, and were also seeking redress.

History on the margins

A cultural and ethnic melting pot for over 450 years, the population identifying as 'Betawi' reflects the city's social and cultural heterogeneity. The most commonly accepted theory is that Betawi identity emerged from the intermixing of various ethnic groups brought to the colonial capital of Batavia by the Dutch to work as indentured labour, slaves, domestic servants or soldiers (Castles 1967). After hostilities with the Mataram kingdom of central Java in the mid-seventeenth century, the Dutch feared that more readily available Javanese slaves would conspire to revolt against them. To avoid this, they preferred to bring in ethnic minorities from the more far-flung reaches of the Indies, such as Bali, Ambon, Manado and Sumbawa, as well as Sri Lanka and India. Being at the confluence of various trade routes and a trading hub, the city was also a magnet for merchants, including large ethnic Arab and Chinese populations. Over time, this intermixing of ethnic groups, social classes and cultures produced a distinctive 'Batavia' culture. In contrast to the neighbouring Sundanese and Javanese, Betawi (derived from Batavia) society was distinctly working class with a strong economic base in petty trading and agriculture, who spoke an egalitarian form of creole-Malay and did not have a traditional aristocracy or social elite. With its incorporation of diverse socio-cultural elements, including strong influences from Chinese and Arab cultures, the parameters of Betawi identity have always been in flux, but retained a working-class base (Knoerr 2014). During the colonial era many Betawi associated modern Western formal education with Dutch efforts at Christianisation, avoiding it in preference of the traditional religious schooling of the pesantren (Knoerr 2014, 204). One consequence of this was that in the post-independence environment few became members of the new Indonesian national elite. Despite constituting roughly 25–30% of Jakarta's post-independence population, Betawi have remained until recent years one of the city's most economically and socially marginal groups.

With a name derived from the former Dutch name for the Indonesian capital and as a product of colonial policy, the Betawi were considered an embarrassing reminder of colonialism by the post-independence nationalist government (Knoerr 2006). Popular cultural stereotypes characterised the

Betawi as uneducated, backward and poor. During the 1950s and 1960s the term all but disappeared from public use and was replaced with 'native Jakartan' (*Jakarta asli*), a term that reflected a more modern and 'Indonesian' sense of identity. Due to its negative stigma many Betawi hid their ethnicity. It was not until the mid-1970s that the Betawi name was revived and regained popularity, mainly due to Governor Ali Sadikin, an ethnic Javanese, who proclaimed himself a 'proud Betawi', albeit an honorary one.

The cultural policy of the New Order involved a reinventing and essentialising of ethnic identity and cultural practices, draining them of potentially disruptive vitality and transforming them into a politically benign form that could be packaged and marketed as 'tradition' (Pemberton 1994). This cultural engineering extended to the Betawi, who finally received government attention and recognition but only as a quaint cultural artefact in the midst of Jakarta's rapid economic growth, characterised by folk arts such as *lenong* and *ondel-ondel*. In 1975 Governor Ali Sadikin announced a Betawi cultural preservation programme and the following year the Condet area of East Jakarta was declared a Betawi 'cultural preservation zone'. As an official living fossil, the area was denied the development of physical infrastructure afforded other neighbourhoods via programmes such as the World Bank-sponsored Kampung Improvement Program. This further marginalised the economically impoverished Betawi communities in Jakarta's east, which had already been forced to the outskirts of the city by the fast pace of urbanisation, in particular the gentrification of inner-city districts, and in-city migration (Abeyasekere 1987, 258).

However, the attempt to depoliticise Betawi communities by turning them into a cultural museum was not entirely successful. In the 1977 general election, which was seen as a litmus test of the extent to which the New Order had cemented its power, Betawi support for the Islamic PPP was one factor that led to its victory over Golkar in Jakarta.[15] The loyalties of poor Betawi lay not with the state and government, who ignored and patronised them, but with Jakarta's network of mosques and *pesantren* religious boarding schools and the traditional authority of Islamic leaders (*kyai*) and scholars (*ulama*), who in turn overwhelmingly aligned themselves with the PPP (Aziz 1998). Even into the late 1970s and early 1980s, many Betawi still preferred the traditional religious education of *madrasah* and pesantren over the secular school system (Aziz 1998). The close connection to the PPP has persisted into the present and has been a key political avenue for a number of prominent Betawi, including those with a preman background such as Abraham Lunggana, to gain entry into the Jakarta regional parliament.[16]

The symbolism of Golkar's defeat in the nation's capital was considered potentially disastrous for the regime and led to a deep suspicion towards Betawi communities in the east.[17] In 1981 an existing Betawi socio-cultural organisation dominated by *Betawi Kota* close to the regime, Mangkudat Iwarda, was renamed the Original Residents of Jakarta Association (*Ikatan Warga Djakarta Asli*, or *Iwarda*) and formally affiliated with Golkar in an

attempt to challenge the legitimacy of those groups whose sympathies lay with the PPP (Shahab 2000). The political tension between Golkar and PPP-aligned Betawi also reflected class tensions between the formally educated and more upwardly mobile Betawi from Central Jakarta (*Betawi Kota*) and the poorer communities in the east (*Betawi Pinggir*).[18] Iwarda played upon the ambiguities of the boundaries of Betawi identity, which had been further stretched by the waves of migration into the capital. Debates over who was 'authentic Betawi' (*Betawi asli*) intersected with political allegiances and drove a deep wedge between the several dozen Betawi organisations (Aziz 1998).

In the New Order's vision of cultural identity, 'authenticity' was contingent upon proclamations of loyalty to the state. Like the fossilisation of the Condet community, what the regime wanted was a static and submissive Betawi who could provide 'ethnic colour' and authenticity to Jakarta's metropolitan sprawl. The reality, though, was that since the 1960s Betawi identity was no longer primarily determined by what Aziz calls 'primordial factors' such as family genealogy or ethno-linguistics, but by the dynamic ongoing process of urbanisation and migration into Jakarta itself (Aziz 1998, 114). Like the origins of the Betawi in the intermixing of diverse groups drawn or brought to the city, there was a gradual 'Betawi-isation' of new migrants into Jakarta, many of whom found themselves forced by prohibitive housing costs and availability to the peri-urban margins of the city. Increased pressures over living space meant that relocated Betawi often had to abandon established livelihoods, such as dairy cows or batik production, pushing more into poverty (Setiawati 2010).

The 1980s had seen a massive increase in foreign investment as Jakarta became the focus of a real estate boom. Land prices soared, as the centre of Jakarta was transformed into a gentrified space for high-rise business towers, exclusive residential areas and spaces of consumption (Silver 2007, 159). Many of the growing middle class moved to the fringes and peri-urban regions of the city to find more space, better amenities and improved standards of living within gated communities and housing estates, where they lived alongside but increasingly separate from long-standing kampung residents, those previously displaced from the city centre together with continuing waves of new economic migrants from rural areas.

The massive and rapid urban expansion of Jakarta has seen the previous satellite cities of Bekasi, Depok, Tangerang and Bogor incorporated into 'greater Jakarta' or Jabotabek region with a population of around 28 million. Since the 1960s Indonesia's economic growth was characterised by the conversion of agricultural lands to urban use at a significant rate. Rapid urbanisation was driven by rural poverty together with domestic industrialisation and the concentration of foreign investment in the capital. Any absorptive capacity of what existed of a formal economy had long since been overwhelmed, leading to pervasive underemployment in sprawling urban kampung and reliance of large numbers of rural-to-urban migrants and displaced

local communities on various forms of informal economic activity. These interlocked processes, of the growth of 'insecure territories' of crowded urban kampung, the 'enclavisation' and segregated spaces for elites and marginalisation of economic livelihoods impacted significantly on the Betawi Pinggir, socioeconomic life and identity. 'Betawi' took on connotations not only of ethnicity or identity but also of social class, namely the working class and poor (Knoerr 2014, 195). A process of *ressentiment* took place, whereby as a response to further socioeconomic dislocation the 'shame of the "defeated" culture of the minority is replaced by its depiction as a virtuous culture characterised by purity, asceticism and communitarian spirit' (Brown and Wilson 2007, 380). Religious piety and asceticism moved to the discursive centre of Betawi Pinggir identity, exemplified in the figure of the kyai. The popular Si Pitung series of films of the 1970s and 1980s, which drew on legends of the Betawi bandits of the colonial period and the culture of pencak silat, constructed an image of local jawara strongmen as pious, charismatic fighters against social injustice and avengers of the poor, prepared to sacrifice in defence of the virtuous community. In interviews, Betawi jawara aged in their fifties and sixties repeatedly cited the movies as a 'huge inspiration' that made them 'rethink what it means to be a Betawi warrior and a leader'.[19]

The regime-manufactured division between Betawi groups was 'resolved' in true New Order corporatist fashion. In 1982 the Betawi Consultative Body (*Badan Musyawarah Betawi* or *Bamus*) was established by then Chief of Staff of the Jakarta Military District (*Kasdam Jaya*) Major-General Edi Nalapraya on the instruction of Governor Tjokropranolo, as the government-sanctioned unifying body for all Betawi groups in Jakarta.[20] Despite its claim to unite all Betawi, the conspicuous omission of traditional community leaders such as ulama and kyai from the Bamus central board and a predominance of Betawi Kota close to the regime meant that it did not gain any popular legitimacy outside Betawi Kota networks (Aziz 1998, 109). During the 1990s a number of kyai, such as FBR's founder Fadloli el-Muhir, showed their displeasure at the elite domination of Bamus by joining the PDI.[21]

The lifting of restrictions on social organisations post-1998 saw a boom in the number of 'Betawi' organisations, with over 50 emerging within the space of two years, most of which affiliated with a reinvigorated Bamus. Aside from the social and cultural appreciation clubs of Betawi students, professionals and the middle class, a new type of populist and aggressive Betawi organisation emerged from the slums and poor kampung in the east of the city, areas that had borne the full brunt of the 1997 economic crisis with massive layoffs of workers in manufacturing industries. These groups asserted a Betawi identity that drew not only from folk arts and theatre but from the symbolism and mythology of the jawara, the Betawi warrior. This mixed with a rhetoric coloured by ethnicised class resentment that claimed to speak for the oppressed and marginalised Betawi Pinggir of Jakarta, and a charismatic leader with a foot in the world of the kampung, martial arts and opposition party politics. The image of the jawara as defender of the weak, as the 'protector' of the

community and its noble and pious values, combined with a tactical resolve to benefit from the opportunities to be found in the changed political environment. The stated mission of these groups was an aggressive and overtly political one, to 'take back' by force if necessary the rights, land and dignity they claimed had been stolen from them by the New Order.[22]

'Smart arses? Smash 'em!'

> In the past Betawi made their living from the fields and gardens. These have now become factories, real estate and malls. These create waste and pollution for surrounding Betawi communities. Then these businesses refuse to employ us, preferring migrants. Betawi cop the crap but enjoy none of the benefits. Is this just? Is this humane? What are we expected to do in such a situation?[23]

The Betawi Brotherhood Forum was formally declared on 29 July 2001 in the Ziyadatul Mubtdi'ien religious boarding school in Penggilingan, Cakung. A sub-district on the fringes of East Jakarta bordering Bekasi, Cakung is a mix of small to medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, several small industrial estates and one of Southeast Asia's biggest bus terminals, crammed between which are densely populated poor and lower-middle-class neighbourhoods, a handful of upmarket estates, and tiny remnants of what less than 20 years previously was a wet rice cultivation area. Long a first point of call for new arrivals to the city, Penggilingan in particular is made up of mixed neighbourhoods of recent and first-generation migrants drawn to work in its furniture and shoe factories, together with older established Betawi communities. The declaration came at a time of heightened tension in the capital. One week prior the national parliament had impeached President Abdurahman Wahid, who was replaced by his deputy, Megawati Sukarnoputeri. Thousands of his supporters had flooded into the capital, many from East Java, prompting fears that riots on the scale of those of 1998 could break out. Betawi groups from Tanah Abang, such as the IKBT, joined as part of civilian forces recruited by the governor as a civilian guard for the special session of parliament. While the Pamswakarsa civilian militias mobilised by General Wiranto in 1998 were ostensibly tasked with protecting the 'nation', in this instance it was 'kampung Jakarta' that was to be secured from outsiders.[24] Other new Betawi organisations and offshoots, such as the Indonesian Betawi Defence Movement (*Gerakan Ketahanan Betawi Indonesia*) led by Abraham Lunggana, also emerged onto the stage with a stated purpose of 'assisting in securing Jakarta from disturbances caused by migrants wishing to cause anarchy'.[25]

The stated reasons for the declaration of the new forum were twofold. First, as a manifestation of apparent 'community alarm' amongst local Betawi leaders over what they claimed was an upsurge in violent crime in Cakung and surrounding Betawi Pinggir areas, which was linked to the presence of ethnic Madurese.[26] Second, the FBR was to be a vehicle for

defending and asserting the rights of Betawi, an answer to the question of 'what to do' about the socioeconomic marginalisation of the Betawi Pinggir within the context of regional autonomy and decentralisation reforms. The rhetoric, however, was not calling for increased public participation or good governance, with the group's slogan, 'Smart arses? Smash 'em! Jabotabek, contest!', and its objective for 'Betawi to become the jawara of their own kampung'.[27] The FBR's head and proclamator was Fadloli el-Muhir, an Islamic preacher and former party politician, together with a small group of kyai, including his nephew Lutfi Hakim, local community leaders, and pencak silat masters and jago from Cakung and surrounding areas.[28] Born in 1961, Fadloli received his religious education at the Bani Latief pesantren in Banten, followed by seven years at the renowned Nahdatul Ulama (NU)-affiliated Lirboyo pesantren in Kediri, later continuing his studies at the Asy-Syafi'iyyah Islamic University in Jakarta. Active in NU student networks, by the early 1990s he had adopted the title of kyai and established the Ziyadatul Mubdtadi'ien pesantren and orphanage in Cakung, which has remained the organisation's headquarters.

Soon after the FBR's declaration, another Betawi organisation, the Betawi Communication Forum (*Forkabi*) also declared its existence. Its founding committee consisted of Betawi Kota figures close to the former regime, such as Edi Nalapraya Irwan Syafie, Generals Nahrowi and Sanif, and headed by businessman and former parliamentarian Hussein Sani. Like the FBR, Forkabi initially claimed itself a necessary response to the 'problem' of Madurese migrants, later defining itself primarily as a social and cultural forum for improving the welfare of young Betawi.[29] The so-called 'Madura problem' that FBR and Forkabi referred to appeared to derive from a number of relatively minor clashes over turf in parts of the city. Numbers of ethnic Madurese in Jakarta were small, comprising only 0.5% of the city's total population in comparison to Betawi, who in official statistics count for roughly 30%. Similar to the case in Sampit, Kalimantan, where bloody conflicts between Dayaks and Madurese migrants in February 2001 had left over 200 dead, the Madurese became, in the words of Klinken, 'lightning rods for popular anxieties much as politically insignificant gypsies did in Western Europe before World War II' (Klinken 2002, 176).

In March 2001, for example, in Kebayoran Lama, South Jakarta, word circulated that a Betawi had been stabbed to death by rival Madurese after his gang established roadblocks, where IDs were checked and people asked if they were Betawi or Madurese. Some accounts suggested the Betawi gang had allegedly been trying to oust a lucrative Madurese security racket and cleaning service, while others said the roadblocks were in response to a minor traffic accident.[30] There was media speculation it could become 'Jakarta's Sampit'.[31] Soon afterwards, in Semper, North Jakarta, the killing of a local Betawi by a Madurese escalated into inter-mob violence, and rumours spread that a 'Betawi orphan' had been stabbed to death in Ujung Menteng. The rumour mill was now in full swing.[32] Rival networks of Betawi and Madurese

had long jostled for control over micro-territories in areas of concentrated informal commerce and street vending in Cakung, in particular near the Cilincing toll road and overpass. Traders of shared ethnicity often congregate in a single area, in part due to a sense of communality, shared skills, as well as in order to foster networks of solidarity in a city where newer arrivals often face difficulties in consolidating a secure place. Madurese in Cakung, many of whom made a living from food stalls, tyre-repair businesses, transport workers and Pak Ogah, spread out along the Cilincing toll road, establishing hamlets on vacant land ostensibly earmarked by the administration for urban parkland. Perceptions of increasing numbers of Madurese muscling in on an economically lucrative area were fed by the FBR, and found further validation in the rhetoric of the governor, who proposed regulations limiting the number of migrants allowed into the city in the interests of security, crime prevention and limiting overcrowding.[33] Since the upheavals of 1998, instances of inter-kampung violence in Jakarta had initially spiked dramatically as gangs fought over the now fluxing boundaries of previously established rackets, territorial zones and city space. What started as inter-gang struggles over turf often involved whole neighbourhoods, at times taking on ethnic overtones mirroring territorial divisions. As Simone points out, preman may amplify ethnic identification and difference at times when it serves the purpose of gaining work, access to resources or to establish grounds (Simone 2010). The FBR quickly exploited Betawi–Madurese tensions in such a way. One member characterised the 'Madura problem', and the FBR's role in 'solving' it, as follows:

> The problem with the Madurese is that they stick together in groups, are stubborn, and when they finish a work contract they refuse to go back to their home. Instead they just set up in our neighbourhoods, take our jobs, our land and bring all their relatives to live with them. They have an attitude about them too, walking round as if they own the place…If it weren't for us [the FBR] showing our machetes they would just take over![34]

'To become jawara in our own kampung'

A month after the FBR's declaration, a mob, referred to in media reports simply as 'Cakung residents' but which reportedly consisted of new FBR recruits, burnt down what were described as 'illegal houses' belonging to Madurese. No arrests were made, and the police did not intervene when the mob prevented the fire brigade from entering the area. The FBR began conducting regular motorcycle convoys around Madurese neighbourhoods brandishing machetes and knives, in what was seen as deliberate provocation.[35] More widespread conflict broke out in the area in March 2002 after a Madurese was beaten to death. In response, Madurese, including those from other parts of the city, launched attacks on those they believed responsible – the FBR. The FBR retaliated by throwing stones and Molotov cocktails at

the Madurese settlements in Cilincing. For several days the area was brought to a standstill, and police were forced to disperse the two sides with tear gas and warning shots.

At the height of the trouble it was reported that Fadloli had been attacked by a machete-wielding mob of Madurese, but had miraculously emerged unharmed from the rain of blows.[36] The story of his apparent invulnerability soon spread, generously embellished through its repeated retelling to the point that it soon reached mythical proportions. The attack also reaffirmed the assertion that Betawi were no longer safe in their neighbourhood. Hundreds of Cakung locals, and those who identified as Betawi from surrounding areas, flocked to join the group in mass initiation rituals known as *baitan*, in which they took pledges of allegiance to Fadloli, the organisation and upholding Islamic values. Many believed that his apparent invulnerability was a sign that Fadloli possessed a divine mandate to lead impoverished Betawi Pinggir of Cakung to a new 'golden age' (*masa kejayaan*).[37] His status as a respected kyai, combined with his apparent jawara-like invulnerability and 'social bandit' rhetoric, soon led to comparisons with the Betawi culture hero Si Pitung. A leaflet distributed by the FBR in Cakung at the time further incited moral outrage and hostility towards Madurese and other 'outsiders' while reifying the Betawi as a virtuous community:

> Oh children of Betawi, it is the responsibility of all sons of the land to create peace, tranquillity and beauty in the Betawi land which has become the capital of Indonesia. Forgiving, compromising, not vengeful and always seeking consensus, this is the character of the Betawi. But starting from now, let us rise up and unite as Betawi to oppose the migrants who are arrogant, conceited, selfish, vengeful and disrespectful of the indigenous Betawi. We are sick of cruelty and barbarity, one drop of Betawi blood must be answered with an ocean of blood. Starting from now, let us make the Betawi jawara and respected ones [*juragan*] in Betawi land.

The FBR articulated a politics of resentment: the virtuous and long-suffering Betawi who had been swamped and displaced by generations of uncontrolled migration could no longer tolerate the presence of the disruptive migrant 'other'. Once territory had become constructed as the indigenous homeland, it became a symbolically important issue for the FBR and other Betawi preman to 'defend it at all costs'. The FBR were quick to ethnicise existing tensions over control of informal economies in Cakung together with the socioeconomic and spatial pressures common to Jakarta's kampung, conflating them with an imagined larger battle for the economic and cultural rights of indigenous Betawi. Fadloli declared that the 'battle for Cakung' was one part of a much wider struggle and historical injustice whereby Betawi land and jobs had been stolen by 'illegal migrants who have contributed nothing to the welfare of the city'.[38] This populist rhetoric struck a chord, and within a

year of its establishment the FBR's membership was close to 50,000, with a network of *gardu* command posts spread throughout the city.[39]

As the FBR grew in size, presence and confidence, it extended hostilities and racist caricatures to other, more entrenched groups. Batak from North Sumatra were characterised in FBR leaflets as 'drunks' who had taken over Tramtib, while Ambonese were 'pimps' bringing moral decay, and those from Palembang the source of pickpocketing.[40] Gangs from Banten, including those affiliated to Hassan Sochib, also came under both verbal and physical attacks as outsiders, who despite gaining their own province in 2000 still came to Jakarta to 'steal jobs'.[41] Pemuda Pancasila was also labelled an organisation of 'outsiders' dominated by West Papuans, who in the words of one senior FBR member, 'grew up in the jungle, so aren't used to paying for food'.[42]

Ethnic gangs were scattered all over the city, and many had well-established niches within the illicit and protection economy that had weathered the initial post-New Order transition. Ambonese and Eastern Indonesian gangs, including the networks of Hercules and John Kei, worked primarily in debt collection. Batak, many of whom worked as truck and bus drivers, exercised control over bus terminals, while Banten jawara worked traditional markets. The PP and PPM retained a strong foothold in Jakarta's nightlife industry. At any of the major market districts such as Tanah Abang, Senen, Pasar Minggu or Kebayoran there are complex divisions of territory between various ethnic networks, security groups, preman, the police, military and civil authorities which constantly shift with individual fates and changing socioeconomic conditions and spatial arrangements. Madurese gangs involved in rackets and protection, including those linked to silat groups, have mostly operated at the so-called 'bottom end' of protection economies, such as traditional markets, parking and street trader hubs, and in this respect were often in more direct competition with Betawi groups. Both, initially at least, were generally viewed by well-established groups such as the Pemuda Pancasila as 'rank amateurs', and not constitutive of a serious threat to their turf. Reflecting the association of Betawi with the poor, one Ambonese debt collector characterised Betawi as the 'no-hopers' of the underworld: 'they *aspire* to being preman, but they don't have the brains or the balls…that's why after all these years the best they can do is collect parking fees or hit up cigarette sellers. They squabble over the crumbs while we make real money.'[43] The spaces that they were seeking to contest, however, were in many respects quiet different, as was the constituency they sought to appeal to, which included but went well beyond the 'preman underworld'. Representing battles over turf and space in ethnicised terms and as a struggle over rights to the city was advantageous to Betawi groups politically, and became a powerful recruiting tool.

The FBR's construction of a Betawi 'Us' initially involved a 'thickening' of what has historically been a fluid and creole identity. 'Betawi-ness' was initially linked to a largely parochial notion of Betawi Pinggir identity: the world of pesantren, pencak silat and jago mythology, as well as distinctive dialect

and those whose 'great grandfathers and great grandmothers were born, lived and died here'.[44] It was only later, as opportunities to expand emerged, that the definition of 'Betawi' was loosened to allow the incorporation of other gangs, networks and communities more easily.

One of the first major public acts of violence by the FBR was an attack on the Urban Poor Consortium (UPC), a pro-poor advocacy group. The UPC had been demonstrating outside Jakarta City Hall against the government's poor handling of flood disaster relief. Its chairperson, Wardah Hafidz, had also repeatedly voiced allegations that the governor was receiving payoffs from developers in return for allowing them to build in areas allocated for social housing and urban parkland, a long-standing practice of successive governors.[45] The attack was exceptionally brutal, with men, women and children badly beaten, and Wardah having a machete held to her throat.[46] It was widely regarded as proof that the FBR was on the governor's payroll, little more than the next generation of rent-a-thug.[47] Bertrand, for example, suggests there is no other evident explanation than an unholy alliance between the FBR, which he characterises as a network of martial arts clubs with connections to 'organised crime', and the political interests of the governor (Bertrand 2010, 81). Sutiyoso is likely to have encouraged the attack, if indirectly.[48] His public rhetoric demonising poor migrants as the source of the city's problems was already a tacit green light. In interviews with FBR members involved, it was recounted that they had been 'tipped off' that the UPC were 'communists' intent on stirring up trouble amongst kampung residents, and that Wardah, in particular, was an outside agitator funded by 'foreign interests'.[49] Yet there was another dimension. As an advocate of Jakarta's poor, the UPC was seen as a direct competitor for 'capturing' the marginalised for whom the FBR claimed to speak. Some of the poor demonstrating with the UPC in fact came from areas in which the FBR had newly established branches.[50] In effect, it considered the UPC a rival for its Betawi underclass constituency and also a defender of those to whom it initially defined itself in opposition: poor migrants. Fadloli's explanation of his hostility towards the UPC was revealing in this regard: 'they provoke and manipulate the poor for their own agenda…what's more they ignore the FBR.'[51]

The FBR's antagonism also extended, initially, to so-called 'Betawi elites'. Without the existence of a traditional Betawi aristocracy or ruling class, they created one, in opposition to whom they situated themselves as the authentic representative of the Betawi community. This initially came in the form of the Betawi Consultative Body (*Badan Musyawarah Betawi* or *Bamus Betawi*). Reviving tensions of the 1970s, the FBR identified itself with the historically marginalised Betawi Pinggir, whose communities were concentrated in East Jakarta. Fadloli branded Bamus Betawi as the organisation for 'elite Betawi', the Betawi Kota and former Ikwarda from central and south Jakarta, who did not have roots in the world of pesantren or kampung.

Despite Bamus Betawi's apprehension towards the FBR, in particular that of its chair, Abdul Syukur, who had called the FBR an 'embarrassment' to

the Betawi community, it nonetheless encouraged its affiliation.[52] The FBR's sudden and dramatic growth had startled Bamus and their contradictory statements, that it should join and that it should be disbanded, reflected this.[53] By 2002 the FBR's membership already dwarfed any other Betawi organisation in the city, and its roots in socially marginal communities and its fiery rhetoric were intimidating, but also enticing to Bamus Betawi's leadership, for if the organisation could be 'tamed', it offered access to a politically significant constituency which so far had eluded them. The FBR initially refused on the grounds that it would not allow itself to be dictated to, especially by those who did not represent 'ordinary' Betawi.[54] This put them at odds with Forkabi, which like the FBR drew a sizeable proportion of its membership from preman and the unemployed, but whose leadership was much more closely aligned with the Bamus Betawi leadership, including former regime figures such as Edi Nalapraya, and who early on formed a close alliance with the National Mandate Party (*Partai Amanat Nasional* or PAN). After Fauzi Bowo replaced Abdul Syukur as head of Bamus Betawi, the FBR changed its stance and affiliated. Bowo's promotion by Sutiyoso to vice-governor of Jakarta in 2002 helped to consolidate the FBR's access to a receptive 'Betawi' ear in government.[55] Bowo was poised to be the city's first Betawi governor, so co-option of the FBR was crucial to help garner the 'Betawi vote'. Fadloli readily accepted an offer to become the deputy chair of Bamus Betawi. Much to the disquiet of other Bamus Betawi affiliates, it was now dominated by a mass organisation of preman, the working class and the poor.

With this foot in the Betawi establishment, connections with the city administration and a network that was expanding out from East Jakarta to other parts of the city, the FBR began further to articulate its social and political objectives and demands, and to flex its muscles. Aside from contesting local protection rackets from rival groups, it began pressuring businesses to make regular 'donations' to the organisation in the interests of supporting the Betawi, with the implied threat of retribution if they failed to comply. The group demonstrated and enforced pickets at factories, malls and supermarkets such as Giant and ITC, demanding they employ local Betawi, shorthand for its members.[56] Some successes in gaining work through this method, as we shall see in the following chapter, saw a greater influx of new members. By 2003 its fortnightly initiation rituals held at the group's headquarters were attracting well over 300 people.[57] In the industrial area of Pulo Gadung, the FBR charged trucks an 'entrance fee', considered a 'tax' for security as well as for the right to operate in a Betawi heartland area. The city administration was lobbied to fund a skills training centre for unemployed members as part of its obligation to assist Betawi.[58] Having just won re-election for a second term, Sutiyoso rejected the request. This was to become a pivotal moment for the group as, in the words of Lutfi Hakim, 'we began to realise at that point that politicians were only interested in us insofar as we could help them secure power'.[59] This would lead to a distinct shift in its strategy away from 'a naive belief that our loyalty would be repaid', to one that 'focused upon using

alliances strategically to achieve our goals, while maintaining our autonomy and independence'.[60]

Conclusions

The rise of new Betawi groups such as the FBR embodied a number of intriguing contradictions. They invoked ethnicity and localism as part of a territorial logic to gain strategic advantage over rival groups, and articulated rights claims framed within histories of community struggle and experiences of social and economic marginalisation. Parochial notions of Betawi culture and identity sat alongside broader class resentments and expectations that regional autonomy should deliver material benefits and exclusivist rights to 'indigenous' residents. This enabled them to recruit from the 'usual suspects', such as local preman, jago and the unemployed youth, but also with a degree of broader appeal to poor and working-class Betawi seeking an organisational vehicle to assert an invigorated sense of a right to the city in the post-New Order socio-political context. By creating fault lines out of the socio-spatial tensions that characterise Jakarta's kampung and informal street life, they played a classic protection gambit: manufacturing conflicts and 'threats' to which they presented themselves as a viable solution. The timing was also opportune, insofar as the administration was looking for a new post-nationalist framework through which to govern the city and establish tactical alliances with informal power holders. So at the same time as critiquing the state for having failed the marginalised they claimed to represent, the FBR initially reproduced more familiar patterns of political thuggery on behalf of political elites while carving out a space for itself in the world of Jakarta's protection rackets. Its politics was oppositional, pragmatic and opportunistic.

Simone has discussed what he refers to as a 'traditional' form of the preman, 'someone willing to attempt to translate between different ways of seeing the neighborhood, different ways of doing things and actively mediating relationships among people' (Simone, cited in Turpin, Bobbette and Miller 2013, 79). This role has since 2001 been gradually supplanted and transformed by the rise of mass organisations such as the FBR which, as we shall see in the next chapter, have incorporated smaller gangs and individual preman via a franchise-like system, and more broadly situated themselves as mediators between 'the kampung' and city authorities. As it developed city-wide networks it was able to demonstrate an ability to 'protect' its members from both the police and rival groups, and gain them access to jobs.

Notes

1 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, former head of the FBR, Jakarta, 2005.
2 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2005.
3 Social sovereignty is understood here in the sense outlined by Latham (2000, 3), as an institutional arrangement with political authority over a given community,

'understood as an attribute of not just states but of other forms of social organisation as well'.

4 Interview with Murhali Barda, head of FPI Bekasi, Bekasi, 2012.

5 See for example, *Vivanews* (2012) 'Penggusuran pedagang, FBR datangi Stasiun Depok Baru', 17 December.

6 For example, the FBR and others demonstrated against Greenpeace in response to its anti-palm oil campaign in what many considered a rent-a-protest subsidised by the palm oil industry. It has also engaged in protests against supermarket chains such as ITC and Giant for not employing locals and for undermining local economies.

7 Interviews with FBR and trade union leaders, Bekasi, 2012.

8 At a seminar the author gave to development NGOs in Jakarta, many bemoaned the fact that while kampung residents joined groups such as the FBR in droves, few showed any lasting interest in their own organisation or programmes. When asked why they thought this was the case, a number suggested, with evident disappointment, that the poor were not able to recognise what was really in their best interests.

9 A view that has often been reproduced in Indonesian scholarship, both during and after the New Order. See for example, Meliala (1998, 46), who states that 'the language of violence' is an inherent feature of the lives of the lower classes in Jakarta.

10 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2006.

11 Interview with Lutfi Hakim, Jakarta, 2012.

12 For a comprehensive report on the mass evictions carried out by the Sutiyoso administration, see Human Rights Watch 2006 report.

13 Jakarta residents are defined by government as those possessing a Jakarta ID card, which can give access to certain services such as subsidised health, education and housing. The procedures for obtaining one are lengthy and expensive, and often require documentation that many poorer residents in particular do not have.

14 Interview, Jakarta, 2005. In other parts of the country, however, in particular North Sumatra, the PP has maintained a strong presence. See Hadiz 2011a, and Ryter 2009.

15 The only other province in which Golkar lost the vote was in Aceh. On the 1977 election, see Cribb 1984.

16 Lunggana was elected into the Jakarta regional parliament in 2009, serving as the parliamentary chairperson, and was re-elected in 2014.

17 The Jakarta election loss for Golkar resulted in a renewed political purge of critics of the regime, the success of which was reflected in the 1982 election in which Golkar won in Jakarta by a landslide.

18 There are generally considered to be four main distinct Betawi groups: the Betawi Pesisir from coastal regions to the west and east; the Betawi Tengah in Central Jakarta; Betawi Pinggir in the eastern parts of the city; and the Betawi Udik extending from Depok in the south to Cikarang in the east. Other recognised groups include Betawi Cina and Betawi Arab. For more on this, see Knoerr 2014, 98–129.

19 Interview with Betawi jawara, Jakarta, 2007. For more on the Pitung legend, see Till (1995) and Knoerr (2014, 181). A more contemporary example is that of Johnny Indo and his gang Pachinko (short for *Pasukan Cina Kota*, Kota Chinese Troops). During the late 1970s they committed a number of audacious robberies of gold stores in Jakarta, with rumours that he distributed the spoils to poor neighbourhoods. After serving five years in Nusakambangan prison, from which he briefly escaped, he went on to become an action film star and Islamic preacher, even playing himself in a film named after him that gives a dramatised and romanticised version of his exploits.

20 Nalaparaya, himself a Betawi, served as a commander of Suharto's private security detail and was a close friend of the Suharto family. A major-general in the armed forces, he was deputy chief of staff of Kodam, and vice-governor of Jakarta from 1984–87. He also served as the head of the Indonesian Pencak Silat Association (*Ikatan Pencak Silat Indonesia*, or IPSI) for 25 years.
21 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta 2005.
22 *Tempo* (2005) 'FBR: Tanah warga Betawi dirampas penguasa Orde Baru', 28 September.
23 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2005.
24 *Jakarta Post* (2001) 'Governor warns officials of influx of people to the city', 26 April.
25 Interview with Abraham Lunggana, Jakarta, 2009.
26 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2005.
27 In Indonesian, 'Yang kurang ajar, hajar! …Jabotabek, rebut!'
28 A member of the PDI since the early 1990s who after the events of 1996 followed Megawati, he was appointed by her to the *Dewan Pertimbangan Agung*, or DPA, a presidential advisory board.
29 Interview with Irwan Syafie, 30 August 2005, Jakarta. Syafei was on the advisory board of Forkabi but left in protest over what he saw as the organisation's 'thuggish behaviour'.
30 *Jakarta Post* (2001) 'Murder suspects gang members', 29 March.
31 *Tempo* (2001) 'Kasus Pasar Kebayoran Lama tidak akan menjadi Sampit ke dua', 27 March.
32 One Betawi vendor recounted that there were rumours Madurese had called on their relatives back home to come to Cakung to help in a 'massive takeover'. Interview, Jakarta, 2004.
33 *Tempo* (2001) 'Pemda DKI batasi jumlah pendatang ke Jakarta', 16 July; and *Jakarta Post* (2001) 'Sutiyoso seeks to limit migrants', 8 December.
34 Interview, Jakarta, 2008.
35 *Suara Merdeka* (2002) 'Massa dua etnis nentrok di Cakung', 16 July.
36 Interview with FBR members, Cakung, 2003. One FBR member was killed in the attack on Fadloli. Photos of Fadloli's badly damaged Mercedes Benz take pride of place in the FBR's headquarters in Cakung.
37 Interviews with Cakung residents and FBR members, 2005.
38 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2005.
39 By 2013 the FBR's active membership was roughly 80,000.
40 Speech at FBR inauguration ceremony along with unpublished internal FBR ms., 2003.
41 Interview with FBR official, Jakarta, 2005.
42 Interview with FBR branch head, Jakarta, 2011.
43 Interview with debt collector, Jakarta, June 2013. He did admit, though, that there were 'exceptions', such as Abraham Lunggana.
44 Interview with senior FBR official, Jakarta, 2006.
45 Interview with Wardah Hafidz, Jakarta, 2004.
46 Another attack on the UPC was carried out again two weeks later at a demonstration held by the group at the Indonesian Human Rights Commission.
47 *Kompas* (2002) 'Pemda DKI bantah biayai FBR', 1 April.
48 A cursory police investigation concluded Sutiyoso had no prior knowledge of the attack.
49 Interviews with FBR members, Jakarta, 2005. The 'tip-off' is alleged to have come from people linked to the Sutiyoso administration. It was also stressed that Wardah was 'not Betawi', and hence had no right to protest on behalf of Betawi residents.

50 In one of these districts the division between those involved in the FBR and the UPC fell sharply along gender lines, with men joining the former and women the latter.
51 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2005. Fadloli's repeated public threats that he intended to physically attack Wardah led to a police investigation, and talk that he should be dismissed from the Supreme Advisory Council (*Dewan Pertimbangan Agung*, or DPA), a largely symbolic presidential advisory board to which he had been appointed by President Megawati in what was considered payment for his loyalty during the New Order-manufactured split in the PDI in 1996. He maintained his position, largely due to President Megawati's quietus, but became the first DPA ever to receive a formal warning.
52 *Liputan6* (2002) 'Bamus Betawi mengajak FBR bergabung', 30 March. In the wake of the FBR attack on the UPC, other senior Bamus members had called for it to be disbanded.
53 *Liputan6* (2002) 'Bamus Betawi meminta FBR dibubarkan', 1 April.
54 Interview with Fadlol el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2006.
55 Bowo, an ethnic Betawi and career civil servant, served for 10 years as treasurer of Golkar in Jakarta before being promoted to head of the Tourism Department under Governor Surjadi Soedirdja (1992–1997). He was Sutiyoso's deputy from 2002–07, before becoming Jakarta's first directly elected governor in 2007. He ran for a second term in 2012, losing to the former mayor of Surakarta, Joko Widodo.
56 *Kompas* (2002) 'Demo peresmian Giant Bekasi, FBR bentrok dengan polisi', 10 July.
57 In 2003 I attended four separate *baitan* rituals where close to 1,000 new members were initiated into the group.
58 *Kompas* (2003) 'FBR minta fasilitas keapada Gubernur Sutiyoso', 9 May.
59 Interview with Lutfi Hakim, Jakarta, 2011.
60 Interview with Lutfi Hakim, Jakarta, 2011

6 Jakarta's political economy of rackets

> Of course you need to kick arse sometimes, but the difference between a real strongman and some snotty-nosed thug is that he knows exactly who, when, how and how often to kick arse…there is an art to it, an economy of force.[1]

Having detailed the circumstances leading to the emergence and gradual consolidation of Betawi gangs and street organisations in Jakarta within the broader context of political decentralisation, this chapter examines in more detail some of the structures, tactics and internal dynamics of rackets. It considers tensions and contradictions that have surfaced as organisations such as the FBR have expanded their presence throughout the city, come into conflict with rivals, and sought to negotiate and consolidate relationships with various interest groups, such as businesses and the police, while still continuing to represent themselves to kampung residents as 'vehicles for the powerless'. The types of protection racket regimes the FBR and others have attempted to establish, the means by which they have sought to do so, and the relations between various rackets will also be outlined, together with the Jakarta administration's ongoing attempts to manage the constellation of players. The chapter concludes with a case study of the Black Eagles, an FBR branch in Pasar Minggu, South Jakarta, providing a snapshot of the complex political economies of rackets in Jakarta's streets and kampung as it developed through the mid- to late 2000s.

Managing protection markets

The deregulated and decentralised security market post-1999 saw a diverse range of new and existing players competing for power, influence, money and contracts in different sectors and spaces. Because neither the military nor police were subject to decentralisation, remaining under the authority of the president, provincial and district governments were left with few formal mechanisms by which to ensure preferred forms of 'order'. Subsequently, as we've seen in the case of Sutiyoso, they frequently established alliances with militias, gangs and paramilitaries and expanded municipal police units such as Satpol PP, whose sphere of authority was determined by local government

ordinances (Kristiansen and Trijono 2005).[2] After the institutional separation of the police from the armed forces in 1999, it became formally responsible for 'security and order' and upholding of the law, with the military's role reduced to that of defence.[3] However, despite significant annual increases in the national police budget – over 150% between 2004–09, which was further supplemented by regional budget revenue – it has retained a low per capita ratio of roughly 160 police per 100,000 people (Yunanto 2009). The bottlenecking of funds at the top end of the police chain of command has resulted in sub-district-level stations often having inadequate resources to cover even basic operational costs (Baker 2013). This has created an imperative for officers to seek off-budget external revenue, with predictable consequences. Becoming something akin to semi-privatised enforcers and protectors for their financiers and revenue sources rather than anything resembling impartial upholders of the law, each police station, unit or department operates, in the words of a police general interviewed by Baker, 'as if it were its own company' (Baker 2013, 141).

The likelihood that a business will be approached by either a legal or illegal protection agency has contributed to a pre-emptive demand for professional and reliable security services from those who can afford them.[4] International security companies such as G4S Security, Pinkerton and Securicor moved in to service the corporate and business sector, while a crowded market of domestic companies compete to corner the security demands of the city's upper-middle classes and rich, such as housing estate, mall and office security, private asset protection or bodyguard services. Former and serving members of the police or military run many of these smaller local companies, such as marines-operated PT Bass (Masaaki 2006). In poor, lower-middle-class and mixed-income neighbourhoods of the city, it has been ormas 'societal organisations', local preman gangs and vigilante groups, together with public order agencies such as the Satpol PP and police, that have offered, imposed and contested protection. Liberalised financial markets with unreliable or costly arbitration mechanisms have facilitated corruption and rent seeking, also generating a self-perpetuating demand for those proficient in resolving a range of 'transactional problems' such as debt recovery, contract enforcement, brokering, and gaining advantage over business or political rivals via intimidation, similar to what Volkov has referred to as 'enforcement partnerships':

> …the function of a violence managing agency (a criminal group, a private protection company, or a similar organisation) devolving from the skilful use of force and intimidation on a commercial basis that allows an institutional environment of business activities to be maintained for client enterprises. The institutional environment involves security, contract enforcement, dispute settlement, informational support, and relations with higher agencies (e.g., the state bureaucracy) if these obtain.
>
> (Volkov 2002, 141)

Groups such as those of Basri Sangaji, Umar Kei, John Kei and Hercules, operating in the interstices between 'legal' and 'illegal' services, had risen to prominence by the mid-2000s due to a steady stream of willing and well-paying clientele. The relative success of some of these violent entrepreneurs, as we shall see in Chapter 7, translated into forms of social and political capital periodically useful to the city's national elites but with attendant high risks that resulted in some instances to abrupt ends to their careers, while for others a catapulting into parliament. Violent entrepreneurs have become a needed part of the operation of financial markets, but as such are also uncomfortable and potentially scandalous reminders of the realities of how business and politics are conducted.

The overall situation resulting from these dynamics is not dissimilar to Varese's assessment of the private protection market in Russia, in which 'protection firms, police departments, fragments of security services moonlighting on their working time on behalf of private employers, respond to market and non-market incentives and offer protection to legitimate and non-legitimate businesses' (Varese 2001, 188). As Varese also notes, as legal protectors operate in the same market as violent entrepreneurs, they can 'eschew conflict in favour of tacit co-operation and agreements to share clients or segments of the market' (Varese 2001, 72). Shortfalls in formal policing capacity and resources in Indonesia have seen precisely this, with the outsourcing and division of policing roles to and between local preman, ormas, vigilantes, informal leaders and private security providers. This political and economic reality is reflected, and in effect institutionalised, in Police Law No.2 2002, which stipulates that in carrying out its role the police are to be assisted by 'voluntary civilian security groups', providing the framework by which police at the district or sub-district level can establish working relationships with local 'partners'. As one police officer explained, 'the reality in the field is that these groups [ormas] exist and exercise authority so, like it or not, we need to engage and work with them in the task of making Jakarta safe'.[5] Jakarta police chiefs regularly meet with ormas leaders in order to ensure, in their own words, 'a conducive environment' and that 'their aspirations are heard'.[6] As we shall see via a case study of the Black Eagles, an FBR branch in Pasar Minggu, South Jakarta, negotiated relations of exchange, and demarcations of jurisdiction between the police, ormas and other stakeholders such as business underpin complex local protection economies.

Racket governance

For the city administration, a central mechanism through which localised rackets and protection regimes were managed and governed was via the continuation and expansion of 'anti-preman' campaigns. Through these, a type of indirect or subcontracted rule was exercised that facilitated the narrowing down of the main players, who have then been largely left to make deals and

demarcate turf amongst themselves. The 2001 campaign format, described in Chapter 4, was extended and repeated in 2005 by the Sutiyoso administration, and in 2008 and 2010 by his successor, Fauzi Bowo.[7] Responding to increasing media coverage of street crime, these were accompanied by national 'wars on preman' coordinated by the national police on directions from President Yudhoyono.[8] Ostensibly aimed at reducing preman-related crime, all followed a similar format, with police conducting sweeps of areas considered *rawan* (dangerous/crime infested), arresting and detaining en masse those identified as 'preman'. The numbers were not insignificant. In 2008, for example, there were over 16,000 arrests nationally in the space of two months, whereas in 2012 close to 3,000 were made in Jakarta. However, the impact of the campaigns on crime was determined less by arrest statistics, than by who was targeted and, more importantly, who was excluded.[9] As 'preman' is not a legal category, combined without any clear operational guidelines and a reluctance to confront larger well-organised groups and gangs, police focused largely on 'soft targets': beggars, buskers, the homeless, street vendors or those without identification.[10] The 'war against preman' appeared in practice closer to a war against the poor (Wilson 2012). Of those detained, only a small number were formally charged with any criminal offence, with the majority held for several days or transferred to social rehabilitation centres, the regular dumping ground for those labelled 'social welfare problems' (*Penyandang Masalah Kesejahteraan Sosial* or PMKS).[11]

By the end of the 2005 campaign it was already well understood, despite government and police claims to the contrary, that affiliation with ormas conferred a kind of immunity.[12] Members of Betawi organisations, in particular, were exempted almost entirely, despite increasing calls from sections of the public that 'anarchic' groups such as the FBR, Forkabi and FPI be disbanded.[13] Fractions within the national parliament such as the PDI-P and PKB responded by proposing revisions to long-standing laws regulating societal organisations.[14] The proposal, however, had more broad-ranging implications for constitutional rights to organise and was, after some debate, rejected by parliament.[15] In defending the rights of civil society, parliament had also validated the existence of 'uncivil' groups. The recommendation of the police was that the emphasis should remain upon providing 'guidance' to organisations disturbing public order, with law enforcement efforts targeting 'rogue individuals' or *oknum* who violate the law.

The temporary removal from the streets of several thousand small-time players and petty criminals, or their absorption into ormas, provided enough of an immediate downturn in crime rates that the police could make claims the operation was a 'success', as did the targeted arrest of so-called 'high-roller gangsters' (*preman kelas kakap*) such as the perennial scapegoat Hercules, who according to one police officer, 'becomes the main target of preman elimination' every time there is a change of police chief.[16]

A consequence of this was that each campaign witnessed increased memberships, expanded territory and authority, with the FBR a major beneficiary,

experiencing a doubling of new members throughout the month-long 2005 and 2008 operations, figures mirrored in other ormas such as Forkabi and the FPI.[17] In the wake of the 2008 campaign, the FBR arranged a meeting with the vice-governor, in which they proposed that alleged preman detained during the operation be handed over to them for 'guidance' or given jobs training, while at the same time admonishing the government for targeting the poor and socially vulnerable while ignoring white-collar crime.[18] Many individual preman, jago or small gangs joined larger ormas to seek protection from police raids, a process similar to but less dramatic than that in the aftermath of Petrus in the 1980s.[19] By the end of the 2008 campaign Abraham Lunggana declared that 'the era of turf wars is over', insofar as competition over security and protection markets was now largely 'bloodless', and done primarily through negotiations, contractual agreements or political and police pressure in contrast to the violent conflicts of the late 1990s and early 2000s.[20] This was certainly the case for Lulung, whose businesses Putraja Perkasa and PT Sacom had gained lucrative contracts for security and parking at a number of malls and business parks. He was happy to leave the street brawls to the FBR, Forkabi and others, which he labelled 'amateurish'.[21]

An outcome of the increasing dominance of Betawi organisations aided by the anti-preman campaigns was, according to one former gangster, 'to make a safer, more sustainable and predictable climate in Jakarta'.[22] Lutfi Hakim suggested that the consolidation of the main players had its own stabilising effect:

> With more and more local organizations, including the FBR, growing stronger, these gangs have no choice but to operate their businesses 'more properly' and avoid unnecessary brawls, as their activities have now become the subject of attention of strong, well-organized native Jakartans.[23]

Fearing arrest or extortion at the hands of the police, those not involved in criminality or gangs but nonetheless targeted by the raids sought 'protection' by affiliating or displaying group attributes.[24] Overwhelmingly, it was those living and working in the street, such as vendors, buskers, traffic wardens and other informal workers, populations that the administration had long considered a source of disturbance and potential unrest unless appropriately managed. This served to strengthen ormas claims of being 'representative' street organisations by developing a social base beyond that of preman. Of importance was the ability of organisations not simply to coerce, but to convince residents, informal workers and others of the efficacy or legitimacy of the protection relationship being 'offered', and the opportunities it might provide. This could be in terms of protecting them from predation, the police, other groups or petty criminals, reducing or at least stabilising the costs of doing trade, access to welfare-like services, or to expand their own networks via alliances with organisations that had a reach well beyond the immediacy of the neighbourhood – organisations in a position to negotiate with and make demands on the state and provide some degree of representation.

Either by the inclusion of Betawi groups as 'community partners' in maintaining security, or through their exclusion as targets of anti-preman operations, the Jakarta administration and police had aided in consolidating their street-level authority and influence as mediators between street and state, substantiating the claims of the groups themselves to being a solution to, rather than a source of, the problem of street gangs, preman and crime. It was, as Barker has described in the case of Cicadas, an attempt to outsource social control of volatile spaces in the city (Barker 2009). The belief in the potential of informal leaders and their organisations to organise or exercise degrees of control over the street has been, as we shall see in Chapter 7, a significant form of political capital within the context of direct and multiparty elections, which the consolidation of rackets served to amplify.

Organising territory

How then have these groups organised themselves spatially and defined, negotiated and contested turf? What kinds of practices and 'services' have they offered or imposed, and what has 'protection' meant in practice? In the following sections we shall consider a number of the organisational structures and strategies of the FBR and others, their franchising practices, and how they have 'sold' the organisation to various social groups. What emerges is a complex web of partial and overlapping territorial regimes, imposed relations of exchange, opportunity structures and competitions for dominance, which despite its seeming volatility has displayed a considerable degree of stability.

Up until his death in 2009 Fadloli was known as the 'supreme commander' and dominating central figure of the FBR. A charismatic and fiery orator, his mixture of sharp wit and fiery rhetoric, together with a foot in the world of pesantren, preman and formal politics, was a major draw for many, with members often citing his status as a kyai and rumours of his *ilmu* invulnerability as a key attraction. After 2009 the leadership role fell to Lutfi Hakim, Fadloli's nephew and fellow FBR founder. Relatively young at 33, and with a Master's degree in Islamic theology, he adopted a different leadership style, taking steps to play down Fadloli's previous flirtations with hard-line Islamist groups, and softened the ethnic rhetoric. By now the FBR was a well-established and officially recognised presence, and the shift in leadership style was explained as being 'appropriate' for what was seen as the organisation's growing role and responsibility in 'safeguarding Jakarta':

> We've passed the initial chaotic period where we had to use *golok* [machetes] to establish our rightful place in the city. Now is the time to consolidate, and operate as a stabilising and moderate force in the city.[25]

Known as the *Imam Rempug*, Hakim is advised by a central board as well as various 'departments' mirroring those of government, such as economy, arts and culture, women's empowerment, and 'spiritual and mental guidance',

amongst others. For the most part, these are largely symbolic rather than 'functioning' bodies, replicating a notion of sovereign statehood and self-governance. There are also a number of subsidiary business wings, such as its security company, PT Rempug, and a legal aid foundation available for paying clients and pro bono for members and their families.[26] The FBR central board is assisted by an honorary 'advisory committee', which is approached based on strategic and political considerations, and accept based on its own. Committee members have included Satpol PP head Harianto Badjoeri, retired General and Head of Bamus Nahrowi Ramli, the mayor of Bekasi, as well as various politicians and government officials.

Operational authority within the FBR falls to its *dedengkot*, or 'big shots', of whom there are around 300. Dedengkot are chosen due to their reputation as seasoned fighters and ability to manage conflict, be it instigating or extinguishing it. The head of the dedengkot division, Haji Amirullah, is referred to as the FBR's 'war commander' (*panglima perang*) and is responsible for coordinating between regional field commanders and mobilising FBR networks in response to provocations or clashes with rival groups. With a manicured moustache, *akar bahar* coral bracelets, garish rings and ever-present golok tucked into his leather belt, Haji Amirullah embodies an image of the Betawi warrior drawn straight from the Si Pitung movies of the 1970s, albeit a portly one.[27] Senior dedengkot are always 'on duty', and can be contacted via mobile phone at any time in case of an emergency, and may then deploy in small 'hit squads' or send out calls to other branches for backup.[28] For example, after getting word that an FBR command post in Cibinong had been attacked, half a dozen dedengkot sought out the alleged perpetrators, who were savagely beaten.[29]

Below the dedengkot in this chain of command are jawara, followed by pendekar. The lowest level of this hierarchy is the Pitung, the FBR 'foot soldiers' named after the Betawi culture hero, the organisation also claiming to have 1,000 'Pitung troops' (*Pasukan Pitung*) whose mandate is to 'guard the good name of the organisation and against its misuse'.[30] Regional dedengkot commands also have a Regional Combat Team (*Tim Tempur Korwil*) consisting of several dozen experienced fighters.[31] Each position correlates to a perceived level of fighting capability and charismatic authority, replicating less rigid hierarchies common within traditional pencak silat schools, and articulating a semi-institutionalised and idealised notion of local social order and kampung governance in which the jago strongman is pivotal.

The FBR, as is the case for many ormas in Jakarta, organises itself territorially via a city-wide network of branch franchises and local 'command posts' (*pos komando*, or *posko*) known within the FBR as *gardu*. This territorial command structure reproduces surveillance logics normalised during the New Order and, often quite literally, appropriates the Siskamling neighbourhood watch system. Still functioning post-1998, Siskamling posts are regularly commandeered and repainted in group colours.[32] In some cases, such as in market districts, there can be as many as a dozen such posko in a

single street, in what amounts to an 'overabundance' of those providing security and protection. Usually gardu are situated at concentrations of informal economic activity such as markets, terminals and intersections, or near the entrance to kampung or construction sites, operating as the organisational nexus at the street level from which the local environment can be monitored and financial opportunities identified, also giving the organisation a highly visible presence.

Each gardu has an administrator, an advisory committee consisting of local patrons and 'influential figures' (*tokoh masyarakat*) and officially at least 100 members. Minimum membership requirements are designed to ensure that if resistance is encountered there are sufficient numbers and it can claim to be in some way 'representative' of the neighbourhood.[33] Gardu within an administrative district or *kelurahan*, are coordinated by a regional commander (*koordinator wilayah*, or *korwil*), who in turn answers to the central leadership committee. Dedengkot are assigned to each of the five regions of Jakarta, which mirror its formal administrative boundaries, and are responsible for coordinating the collection of membership fees as well as safeguarding the organisation's name. There are also commanders for Bekasi, Tangerang, Bogor and Depok. Gardu range from rudimentary shelters made from bamboo and plywood to two-storey brick-and-tile buildings elaborately decorated with murals and *ondel-ondel*.[34] Members take pride in their gardu, and its size and level of decoration is a visible sign of the FBR's success and relative power in the area, given that its construction is subsidised by money from local business and membership fees. Gardu are assigned a number and choose a name, examples including the Sea Ghosts (*Hantu Laut*), Betawi Lions (*Singa Betawi*), Knight Wolves (*Srigala Malam*) and Wild Cats (*Kucing Liar*). As of mid-2014 the FBR had 335 gardu spread throughout greater Jakarta.

Despite the existence of this formal hierarchy, the idea of a godfather-like leader holding absolute authority backed up by a military-style chain of command that can mobilise a mass of loyal troops at will is part wishful thinking and an often deliberately exaggerated image, a 'useful myth' in representing the organisation as a powerful and effective city-wide force.[35] In the day-to-day life of the organisation and its members, the reality is closer to an 'institutionalised bricolage' of local rackets and gangs, political militancy, networks of solidarity and identity, patronage relationships, and social and economic opportunities (Hagedorn 2007). This retains coherence as an organisation through combining a 'legitimizing identity' that supports existing authority, and identities of resistance and resilience that are integral to informal economies and poor communities in Jakarta.[36]

Modes of expansion

> Seeing the approaching FBR mob (about 200 motorbikes), vendors at the market panicked, quickly grabbing what they could and ran towards the park behind

> them. The FBR yelled out that they weren't here to make a problem, and asked the vendors to go get whoever 'held' (*pegang*) the market. A thin tall man in glasses appeared. The FBR outlined to him what they wanted – to set up a *gardu* at the market, be paid protection dues, and for eligible vendors to join the FBR. In return, they would ensure the area was 'safe from preman' as well as deal with the threat of eviction by Tramtib. The reason? 'Monas had always been Betawi land, since the days of our ancestors, and now was the time to take it back.' None of the FBR members lived anywhere near Monas, so this wasn't exactly their home turf, but no one was going to argue. While it had the outward appearance of a 'reasonable' discussion the man was clearly nervous and, by simple fact of being one against a couple of hundred, was not in any real position to negotiate. Several Tramtib officers had taken off as soon as they saw the FBR mob. The vendors stayed back inside their stalls. Sweating profusely, the man politely agreed to the FBR's 'offer', and soon after the FBR guys up and left, leaving behind an FBR flag tacked to a bamboo pole, clearly satisfied and buoyed by the ease with which they had claimed new turf. A Tramtib van left behind by the fleeing officers became an object of their sense of power, a rear vision mirror ripped off and the doors kicked. They cursed them as 'Batak dogs'.[37]

This account of an FBR branch from South Jakarta's attempt to take control of a food vendor's market near the National Monument in the centre of the city appeared a great success, a bloodless walkover through weight of numbers. It was, however, unsuccessful. In the following days Tramtib increased patrols and removed FBR banners with no resistance, and within two months the vendors had been evicted. The reasons why it failed are more broadly indicative of the conditions, networks and alliances conducive to, if not necessary for, establishing a sustained presence as a protection regime. The reputation of a group or naked shows of force at the street level are not a substitute for embedded social relations of exchange and reciprocity, including those with the police, which are usually built up over considerable time. What, then, have been the methods by which organisations have been able to expand their reach into new parts of the city? One central means is through a variety of interrelated processes which can be broadly described as 'gang franchising'. Also referred to as 'gang colonisation', gang franchising has been defined in criminology and gang studies literature as the intentional extension of a gang of the same name into new spaces, territory or markets, usually through the geographical migration of members to new cities, active recruitment of local youths, the selling or subcontracting of the gang name, or via the expansion of illicit markets such as narcotics (Weisel 2002). Within the spatial terrain of Jakarta, gang franchising has entailed elements of displacement, expanding reciprocity and patronage networks, and co-opting local constellations of informal power and authority.

Central to gang franchising in the context of Jakarta has been the ability of the FBR, Forkabi and others to entice and incorporate preman, pre-existing gangs, informal leaders and their communities as well as kampung youth peer groups under their organisational and ideological umbrella. The reasons for

affiliation vary considerably, from access to its networks, opportunity structures and services, the strategic advantage gained in local rivalries, alleviation of police pressure, the appeal of an identity and ideology that prioritises 'Betawi' above others, and an organisation that will 'fight' on their behalf. According to one senior member, there are three main reasons: 'because they share our values and goals, because they are looking to gain an advantage politically or in business, or they are afraid of us and think it's safer to be with us than against us.'[38]

This franchising has occurred as an outcome of the spread of the FBR's name and reputation, and also as an active organisational strategy. Ojek motorcycle taxi drivers, for example, whose knowledge of the comings and goings of a neighbourhood is without match, have been targeted for recruitment, as have pencak silat schools and some vendor and resident associations. In the wake of a renewed series of mass evictions of informal settlements in 2013 by the administration of Governor Joko Widodo, the FBR acted as the organisational face of community resistance in a number of cases, such as Ria Rio, Pendongkelan.[39] Often it is a case of these being the only organisations that actively reach out to kampung youth, to make visible otherwise largely invisible political actors. In many neighbourhoods, FBR and other ormas members have become RT or RW (*rukun tetangga* and *rukun warga*), the most local government administrative positions, or vice versa, using the gatekeeper and surveillance function to formalise their security rackets, and using official capacity to distribute fees and jobs such as rubbish collection, etc., to members.[40] This in turn has further embedded these groups in kampung life, in contrast to other, more dispersed or 'free-floating' gangs and organisations.

Acceptance into the FBR franchise is not without conditions, including the abandonment of direct profiting from illicit or 'immoral' activities such as prostitution and gambling, a sticking point for some. Other obligations include attending FBR events which are crucial for displaying its ability to mobilise a mass, which through the presence of politicians and officials simultaneously serves to demonstrate to members that this is an organisation that has access to formal power. The FBR's membership oath overwhelmingly stresses self-sacrifice in the interests of group solidarity and obedience to FBR leaders, perhaps to counter-balance awareness of the self-interest motivating many. As the FBR expanded in size and reach and sought to make itself a truly city-wide organisation, it faced the practical constraints of an organisation that still defined itself in terms of a parochial construction of indigenous identity. This was resolved in simple fashion by 'loosening' who or what was 'Betawi'.[41] Since taking over the leadership, Hakim began 'naturalising' people as Betawi, using this to make strategic appointments in order to incorporate and establish a foot in other parts of the city.[42] For example, in the low-budget tourist street of Jalan Jaksa in central Jakarta a local strongman, former army private and amateur boxer Siwo Max Wekan from Tanimbar Island, Ambon, was appointed as a dedengkot, bringing with him a sizeable gang of Tanimbar youth. It also reflected a changing sense of its own

place in the city as 'something bigger' than its starting point in gang conflicts in East Jakarta and as a reaction to the historical exclusion of the Betawi Pinggir.[43]

For other ethnic gangs in the city, expansion, contraction and continuity of members is intertwined with in-city migration and the salience of familial and clan networks. Gangs from Ambon, Flores and Timor, for example, have been among the waves of new arrivals to the city from the mid-1990s in search of jobs and opportunities.[44] Fellow clan members, or those from the same region who have made a name in the capital, are a source of work, networks of solidarity and trust, and often a place to sleep. The Kei clans, in particular, from Kei island, Ambon, have carved out a niche in the world of debt collection, where they competed with fellow Ambon clans such as the Sangajis, the Flores gang of Thalib Makarim and the Timorese networks of Hercules. These clan links and regional ties have often become entangled with business rivalries, overlapping client bases for their services, and volatile notions of loyalty and honour which have resulted in some of the bloodiest and most brutal inter-gang violence. Wars between the Keis, Sangajis and Hercules have raged since the late 1990s, leaving several dozen dead, coming to at least a temporary end with the arrest and imprisonment in 2012 of John Kei for the murder of PT Sanex Steel Director Harry Tantono in an apparent debt collection gone wrong, followed by the Petrus-style killing of his brother, Tito Kei.[45] Previous inter-gang battles, some involving exchanges of gunfire in busy Jakarta streets, served to mark eastern Indonesian gangs as 'wild' (*liar*) and unpredictable. Despite their high-end clients, including several international banks, they have been the object of numerous targeted police operations, something Betawi groups have been happy to capitalise on.[46] One FBR dedengkot explained, as follows:

> It's clear that if we look around at all the disturbances going on in Jakarta, the preman involved are not Betawi but preman from outside. Why is it that those wishing to eliminate gangsterism accuse FBR of being a source of it? It's simple, it's because they are afraid of losing 'turf' and work to us.

Internal rivalries or the fracturing of a gang network after the death or imprisonment of a leader can result in opportunities for others to expand networks and turf by absorbing members, taking the opportunity to displace them spatially or in the market, or using outbreaks of violence to underscore the efficacy and necessity of their own protection regime. After Basri Sangaji's murder in 2005 a number of his followers were absorbed into Abraham Lunggana's security and parking company franchise. In Lunggana's words, this was in order to avoid them becoming 'like loose kites', 'free agents', who without supervision or guidance would become a source of trouble to themselves and the city.[47] It also facilitated the expansion and diversity of Lunggana's client base.

Points of conflict and violence

Despite Lunggana's claim that 'turf wars' in Jakarta were no more, violent clashes between members of ormas remain frequent. The FBR, BPPKB and PP, in particular, regularly engage in street fights, pelting each other with rocks, destroying each other's command posts, and stabbing and gashing each other with knives and machetes.[48] This can be sparked by anything from a passing exchange of insults and resultant loss of face, displays of bravado, ethnicised rivalries, to more material struggles over control of informal markets, such as parking, or support of different political candidates. Conflicts of this kind can in some instances result in the redistribution of access to jobs and rents, but more often serve to consolidate and clarify the micro-territories of respective parties. The greater one's reputation, the less likely that actual violence is necessary, eliminating the potential costs and risks that it brings. At the same time, for a preman or jago to be known, they must periodically 'make a problem' and then resolve it in some fashion.[49] Violence in this sense serves to reaffirm collective identity in opposition to others, which gives it a certain degree of predictability. An outcome of franchising is that local tensions and hostilities between rival preman can be exaggerated and amplified, as ormas members from other areas come in to support their comrades.[50] This may be a 'considerable nuisance', as one police officer described it, but one that is balanced against the relative overall 'stability' afforded in contrast to unpredictable and dislocated groups.[51] Despite periodically complaining that ormas are a source of trouble, the Jakarta police nonetheless maintain that they remain 'a powerful component supporting the police in creating security and order in their respective communities'.[52] The onus of ormas leaders is almost always upon a quick resolution to these outbreaks of violence, which are usually framed as 'misunderstandings', or caused by oknum members, who in some cases have been expelled from the organisation.[53]

Violence between ormas and preman gangs also occurs in the context of working as enforcement partners on behalf of clients. This includes, for example, debt collection, an industry that has boomed since the 1990s and the growth of the private finance and banking sectors.[54] Contests over the use and ownership of land has been another key area in which violent entrepreneurs and ormas have carved out a niche as brokers and enforcers in the context of corrupt and poor regulation. During the 1980s and 1990s the PP regularly worked on behalf of property tycoons such as Tommy Winata to clear land of residents forcibly and similar partnerships have continued post-New Order. However, the overall situation has become more complex, with developers, government departments, political parties and informal communities entangled in legal, political and moral struggles for space. Jakarta is renowned for its confusing and corrupt system of land tenure, with over 2,000 pieces of overlapping and often contradictory legislation, often resolved via payoffs, bribes or political pressure rather than adherence to any clear legal principle (Firman 2004). Disputes over title and rights to the use of land are frequent,

with backlogs of literally tens of thousands of cases in the court system. As Simone has stated, it is a city 'lacking in well-elaborated regulatory frameworks concerning the rights and participation of citizens, basic planning, and the use and marketing of land' (Simone 2010, 67). This is set against a larger backdrop in which the majority of the city's residents have little in the way of secure tenure, with semi-formal or informal arrangements often involving complex negotiations and deals with local officials, land brokers and preman, which can rapidly shift based on commercial arrangements or changes in government policy priorities.[55]

This has created a strong market and political demand for coercive forms of 'land brokering' to force resolutions of contestations over title or disputes over rights to the use of land. There are stand-alone broker agencies, and it is typically one of the 'services' offered by ormas such as the FBR, Forkabi, BPPKB and others, in particular those with widespread grass-roots networks. Typically land brokering involves physically occupying disputed land to prevent its seizure, forcibly removing existing occupants or subjecting rival claimants to varying degrees of intimidation in order that they sell at a reduced price or relinquish a claim. Occupying land can also shift the economic climate to the competitive advantage of a client by impacting upon land speculation. Prior to accepting a job, brokers will investigate the legal and political background of respective parties and assess the potential economic or political benefits of involvement. Compensation for their services can be paid in cash, entail ongoing partnerships such as permanent security jobs, or in some cases shares in the contested land/business.[56] Often each claimant will employ the services of one or more ormas, preman gangs or broker groups, which sets the scene for violent clashes.[57] If things go wrong it will be the brokers rather than the clients who are arrested. Even in cases managed directly via the courts, ormas have mobilised to intimidate the judiciary directly when decisions go against a claimant, or made 'final stands' against police executing court orders, in the hope that it might force renegotiation or temporarily reduce land prices.[58] Mobilised violence or the threat of it serves to force an outcome, constituting the utility that land brokers provide.

In the early years of its existence the FBR was frequently deployed as paid muscle in government evictions of vendors and slum dwellers, such as around Cilincing, Cakung, the site of its conflicts with Madurese gangs (Human Rights Watch 2006). The struggle to win turf from rival gangs intertwined with hopes that collaboration with the Sutiyoso administration would develop into a more permanent partnership in policing public order regulations. However, as the organisation expanded and became more embedded in the social and economic networks of the kampung and informal economies, it moved away from collaborating with the administration in this way. More frequently it became the muscle in defence of those subject to eviction.[59] This was not necessarily a principled stance, as these were often the communities upon which the FBR and preman 'fed', and whose informality and insecurity offered them possibilities for exercising considerable authority. It was often,

however, on the request of kampung residents or vendors themselves, suggesting recognition of the FBR as a 'protector', one of the few organisational vehicles for defending their place in the city against more powerful forces.[60] Ormas in these situations operate less as defenders than as brokers between these forces and the kampung or street economy. Their involvement rarely, if ever, prevents eviction, but can open up lines of communication and negotiation with developers, businesses or government through which compensation, relocation or other concessions can be gained or increased.

What we can do for you

> Joining the FBR is an investment. We pay for our uniforms, etc., so naturally we expect something in return. What we get is moral guidance and access to a network that helps us in obtaining work and money and deal with other social problems…preman, but without the preman-*isme*…the ethic of the preman, as someone brave, strong and independent, but without the thuggery and extortion associated with it.[61]

'The government has failed us, so we are doing things for ourselves' was a frequent explanation given by both leaders and members of the FBR and Forkabi as to the need for the organisation. However, what is it that the organisation actually does for members, and in what ways does this attempt to replicate supposed state functions? These relate to notions of welfare and basic services, rights to work and space, and the defence of the kampung from the encroachment of deleterious social and economic forces. The welfare-like services that the organisation does offer are largely confined to around its headquarters in Penggilingan in East Cakung. Here the FBR is a dominating presence and a prime patron of community events, sponsoring mass circumcisions, funerals and weddings, and communal prayers. The headquarters also contains an orphanage and pesantren.[62] It has several ambulances available for use by members and the immediate community, and a legal aid division staffed by law graduates. Regular skills training, 'entrepreneurship' and job-seeker programmes are run centrally and in branches as part of a broader mission to develop the 'human resources' of the Betawi.[63] Forward planning documents include ambitious plans for health insurance schemes for members. Microcredit schemes have been offered for ojek drivers as well as street vendors. It is, for many, the pride of the neighbourhood: an organisation born of the kampung and one that serves to represent its interests to the 'outside', connecting it to other parts of the city. Of course, these perceptions are not uniform. The 'community' consists of various social groups and interests, and attempts by the FBR to establish itself in new neighbourhoods have often faced hostile resistance.[64]

For the unemployed and disenfranchised young men who make up the bulk of the rank and file membership, reasons for involvement revolve around three main concerns: the search for work, representation and identity, and the

search for respect.[65] Joining the FBR was often framed as a redemptive experience, part of a conscious effort to improve oneself and as a pathway out of petty criminality, drug use and alienation. This was often intertwined with hopes for increased status and authority within one's peer group and neighbourhood, 'from being a nobody, to someone people look up to and respect', as one young member expressed it. The wearing of a uniform and involvement in collective experiences, including ritualised violence, are means to fight back against a sense of social exclusion and inequality. The focus upon the street and the neighbourhood, rather than more distant halls of power, as the stage on which authentic political struggle takes place stimulates militancy and a sense of engagement, as does a collective identity based in kampung traditions instead of one constructed negatively in relation to the 'mall culture' and conspicuous consumption of the city's middle class and rich. As Hagedorn (2008, 49) has stated, 'while the underground economy may become a solution to the gang members' problem of survival, religious, ethnic or communal identity becomes the solution to the problem of meaning'.

The material benefits that affiliation with the FBR brings are often summed up simply as *ngisi perut*, to 'fill the stomach'. Money can be made through various avenues and opportunities, such as paid attendance at political rallies, as security, cleaners or parking attendants at events hosted by the city administration, or through the various security and protection rackets run out of local gardu.[66] Estimates of youth unemployment in Jakarta can be as high as 60–70%.[67] This is set against the backdrop of 70% of Indonesia's working population, and upwards of 80% of those defined as poor, eking out a livelihood in the precarious informal sector (Badan Pusat Statistik 2007). The FBR's leadership articulated its rationale as to why it should have priority in securing jobs and 'tax' from those making money in Jakarta, which was operationalised via a number of strategies that traverse the line between 'legal' and 'illegal', but which have also transformed over time as it has become a semi-institutionalised presence. In its early years 'polite extortion' together with more direct pressure were used to force 'donations' and rents from business on the pretext they had a moral obligation to support the Betawi.[68] A disgruntled businessman who had been the recipient of an FBR extortion letter sent it to the national daily, *Kompas*:

> Recognising the financial limitations we face and the large operational costs we require, via this letter we request a routine monthly donation from your company to help cover these costs. If you refuse our request it will indicate that you and your company don't care for the fate or welfare of the Betawi, and consequently we will do something to your business that is not in keeping with your best interests.[69]

Businesses generally factor in payoffs to local preman or ormas, often as part of a 'social welfare' budget, alongside those to police and government officials.[70] Illicit industries are more inclined to seek out those with connections

to the powerful, including the military, whereas legal ones may prefer organisations that are well established in the surrounding community, something that has increasingly worked in the FBR's favour. According to a senior member, by 2008 pressuring businesses was largely unnecessary, with many voluntarily donating when new gardu opened. Anniversary celebrations now regularly have corporate sponsors, such as the tobacco giant PT Djarum or mobile phone companies. What do businesses get out of this? It can be simply to be left alone, to gain access to a market (many FBR members, unsurprisingly, smoke Djarum cigarettes), protection from others, or to establish relations with organisations that can be mobilised to protect their interests.

For the FBR this opened up opportunities not just for revenue streams, but securing work for its members, one of its key objectives. Its informal recruitment strategies consist of two main types: exercising various types of pressure on businesses to employ members; and operating as sources of informal labour outsourcing. During its early years it regularly picketed the opening of new shopping mall chains such as ITC and Giant Hypermarket, demanding that they provide work to 'native sons'.[71] Smaller businesses such as car dealerships, hotels and restaurant chains were also targeted for pressure campaigns.[72] Due to FBR members generally being unskilled and with little formal education, opportunities when they arose were largely confined to security or parking attendants, in which it had a degree of success. This was later replaced by a more sustained canvassing of businesses with proposals for supplying set numbers of security staff for factories or hotels.

Neo-liberal reforms, such as the 2003 National Employment Law, opened the doors for a new 'labour flexibility' regime that increased the use of casual outsourced contract workers, creating 'a labor force that is easily mobilized and demobilized' (Tjandraningsih 2012, 409). This added to the vulnerability and insecurity of workers, particularly in the manufacturing sector, while creating new markets for formal and informal outsourced labour agents. Like their antecedents, the jago of colonial Batavia, providing and controlling labour has been a staple of preman, one that the 2003 regulation further legitimised. The FBR soon established outsourcing arrangements with factories in Cakung, Bekasi and Bintara in the city's east, supplying them with casual workers for manufacturing jobs as well as security. This opened up new lines of revenue, as companies generally pay monthly fees to the labour provider. The usual arrangement of outsourced workers paying their agent was replaced by ongoing FBR membership for those getting work, creating a strong incentive for others to join and giving the FBR a 'presence' inside factories and industrial estates.[73] The wages and conditions were poor, but in a context of communities where any regular job is often considered better than none, few openly complained.

Outsourcing has severely undermined the power of unions in workplaces, and placed them in an openly antagonistic relationship with outsourced labour suppliers, a situation of obvious benefit to factory owners (Tjandraningsih 2012). It is a means of subcontracted labour control. In Cikarang,

the site of some of the largest industrial and manufacturing estates in Indonesia and a large and militant trade union movement, ormas such as the PP regularly disrupt and disperse union demonstrations. As major providers of outsourced labour, they have a strong vested interest in doing so. Outsourcing has moved to the forefront as the major union campaign issue in recent years, which has intensified these tensions. In October 2013, for example, 500 Pemuda Pancasila armed with machetes and swords attacked a rally in Cikarang by the Indonesian Federation of Metal Workers' Unions (*Federasi Serikat Pekerja Metal Indonesia* or FSPMI) held as part of a national day of action, leaving dozens severely injured.[74]

A major coup for the FBR came in 2010 when Hakim inducted the departmental head of the Jakarta Office for Labour and Transmigration as a member.[75] This held the potential for the realisation of a long-term goal, to gain privileged access to job training and placement opportunities from the city administration, one initially proposed to Sutiyoso, but turned down by him – the reason for the FBR's withdrawal of political support.[76] Its mission to improve the welfare of the Betawi has been translated through the logic of rackets, with the FBR monopolising access to jobs and, in doing so, undermining other forms of organisation and mobilisation for the poor and working class that could potentially lead to substantive improvements in their material conditions.

The Black Eagles of Pasar Minggu

Divisions of territory between gangs, preman, ormas and formal institutional actors such as the police are multivariate and dynamic, spatially, socially and in relation to separate and overlapping spheres of economic activity. Even within a small, geographically defined area, such as a busy street or market district, there can often be anywhere upwards of a dozen different groups operating in what amounts to a complex political economy of rackets, rent extraction, security and protection. One group may monopolise protection money from store owners or minibus drivers, while another may collect informal parking fees or impose protection on street vendors. Amongst this may be 'freelancers' who offer specific services such as debt collection, or those running illicit industries. This can be overlaid by concentrated social networks, such as those based on ethnicity or communal identity, political party affiliations or contesting moral economies. A local jago may claim to control or *pegang* an entire area, but in practice this often means the ability to manage a multitude of relationships in ways that enable them to secure access to rents and resources, while protecting the interests of key stakeholders, including their followers. Charismatic figures can bridge rivalries and play key roles in establishing alliances and brokering conflicts, in doing so increasing their own power.

As discussed, gang franchising has been the preferred method by which organisations such as the FBR have moved into new territory, but conversely

the organisation's name and networks are a means by which local gangs and jago expand their own power and turf. Here we shall examine the case of the Black Eagles (*Rajawali Hitam*), an FBR gardu in the market district of Pasar Minggu, South Jakarta, which provides a window on how new protection regimes are formed through coercive force, but also negotiation and compromise with other social forces and actors. We also touch upon the tensions between the ambitions and hopes of ormas members, and the imperative of leadership to maintain hierarchical control.

With 2,200 market stalls, over 3,000 street vendors, together with a busy adjacent minibus (*angkot*) terminal, Pasar Minggu market has been since the 1980s, like Tanah Abang, something of a preman's paradise.[77] From the early 2000s a mix of gangs and ormas had operated various 'niche' protection rackets. Pemuda Pancasila, for example, extracted dues from street vendors on the southern side of the market, Forkabi on the north, while the BPPKB and a Betawi gang led by a local strongman named Marta took payments for supervising the loading and transporting of goods in and out of the market. Customer parking was run by the Arel and Polo gangs made up mainly of East Javanese, while angkot parked in the main street outside the terminal were the domain of Batak preman. From the mid-1990s a largely Madurese gang had controlled the main market buildings and terminal where the most money was to be made, maintaining its dominance through the post-New Order transition. Petty crime flourished with pickpocket networks working the area, *calo* ticket scalpers and *tukang palak* (street extortionists) in the terminal, and pimps who congregated at nearby *warung remang-remang* (street-side stalls selling cheap alcohol, and often hubs for prostitution).[78] Prior to 2005 the market was, according to several store owners interviewed, in a constant state of tension. Preman often drank alcohol inside the market building, hassling customers and demanding money at random: 'one day it would be Rp.2,000, the next Rp.4,000. If you refused you'd get a beating. Then they'd still go and pickpocket and rob people!' Gang fights frequently brought trade to a standstill and scared away shoppers. There was a general mood amongst store owners and vendors that something needed to change.[79]

The first movement towards a change began with Aa, a follower of Marta, who had a reputation as hot-headed preman, notorious for his heavy drinking, womanising and fighting.[80] After marrying and becoming a father, he resolved to reform himself and spent a year in a nearby *pesantren* undertaking religious studies. There he met an FBR member from Cakung and was impressed by his description of its mission, later attending sermons by Fadloli. After discussions with senior members in Penggilingan, he obtained their blessing to establish an FBR gardu. For the leadership it was an opportunity to gain access to a highly lucrative and politically significant area. As Aa explained, 'I was determined to take the few skills I possessed, namely an ability to persuade people either through my words or fists, and use this to create a sustainable livelihood for myself and others like me'.[81] The first person he needed to win over was Marta. Aa had his own sub-gang of 20

peers, but within the local pecking order he needed Marta's consent, experience and connections. Aa may have been feared, but Marta was 'respected' (*disegani*). He was easily convinced by Aa's plan, meeting with senior dedengkot who promised assistance by providing muscle. They then set about testing the waters, talking widely to store owners, vendors, minibus drivers and local residents, presenting their case for the need to bring a more stable protection order. Most knew of the FBR, its reported links to the governor, police, and flirtations with political parties such as PAN, together with its ostensive mission to make Jakarta 'safe', offering a potential link to more powerful forces in the city. Many quietly gave their support, including key community figures such as leaders of the Pasar Minggu Traders Association.[82]

The requirement of 100 gardu members was easily fulfilled, with over 300 signing up, many defecting from other groups.[83] In May 2005 the Black Eagles were assigned gardu number 0200 under the Southern District Command (*Korwil Selatan*), adopting the English-language motto of 'South Jakarta crime destroyer team'. The Madurese gang were seemingly unaware of what was about to happen. In June 2005 the Black Eagles, with backup from FBR dedengkot and pendekar from the Southern Regional Command, made their move. Vastly outnumbered, after a day of running street battles that left one Madurese dead, the 'battle for Pasar Minggu' was won by the Black Eagles, who took over the Madurese gang turf.[84] Marta and Aa moved quickly to manage relations with other gangs and ormas, setting up regular meetings under the banner of the 'Pasar Minggu Communication Forum', or FKKPI, in order to minimise the possibility of further conflict. It also cemented the position of the Black Eagles as the patron through which divisions of turf and jobs needed to be negotiated. Start-up donations secured from several store owners in the main market building as well as membership fees enabled them to build a two-storey gardu strategically positioned next to a major pedestrian entrance to the terminal and loading area for trucks bringing in produce.[85] From here they were able quickly to establish a highly visible presence, monitor comings and goings, and scout for opportunities and signs of trouble:

> We are from the street, so we know who the trouble-makers are. Most of them we know personally. We say to them, okay if you want to make trouble here you will have to deal with us. Respect us or else! Usually that's enough as they are scared of us. But if they still go and make trouble we wipe them out. Like this one pickpocket, we went round to his house and bashed him good![86]

The Black Eagles began by targeting remaining tukang palak and pickpockets in the bus terminal area, giving them an ultimatum of 'reforming themselves' by joining the FBR, or leaving the area. A number of well-known street-side gambling dens were also shut down with backup from gardu in neighbouring districts, earning praise from local kyai and the Nahdatul

Ulama, but the animosity of Pemuda Pancasila which lost a lucrative source of revenue. The MetroMini minibus company was suitably impressed by Aa and Marta's new protection regime. Tukang palak and calo had long caused considerable financial pain for the company. It has been estimated that illegal fees imposed on public transport companies reached a staggering AU$50 million a year.[87] They offered to make the arrangement ongoing and legal, with Aa signing a contract with MetroMini on behalf of the Black Eagles. In return for regular payments, they would keep the terminal clean of 'disruptive elements' and rubbish. In the main market building a more predictable and regularised protection scheme was introduced, with Rp.1,000–2,000 charged per day to market stall owners dependent on what *jasa* or service they expected in return. Street vendors were charged Rp.1,000 every three days. It was still a protection regime, but one that claimed to offer a needed service. As Marta explained:

> It isn't extortion…you pay and get something real in return. Pay the minimum and the next day one of our boys will sweep up the trash around your stall, pay more and we'll make sure no one disturbs you.[88]

As with all protection regimes, however, those who were reluctant to pay often still got a beating.[89] With close to 1,000 sellers and street vendors now paying dues, the Black Eagles began to amass considerable amounts of money. Salaries for members were calculated based upon a roster system and hours worked, as well as seniority and the type of task. Younger members were usually assigned to waste disposal and sweeping, while more seasoned fighters guarded gold stores or patrolled the market building. Several million rupiah a month was sent to FBR headquarters on top of membership fees, making it one of the most financially successful gardu. Additional funds were used for 'social welfare' activities, such as regular donations to a local orphanage, subsidising yearly mass circumcisions for 50 children of street vendors, and making major contributions to local Independence Day celebrations.

The relationship between Marta and the Pasar Minggu police was another key factor in the ability to consolidate protection rents from the most lucrative parts of the market district. He was on good terms with many of the more senior officers, and had long used this to mediate when his followers got into trouble. These relationships also served to gain police support for the Black Eagles' domination of protection. It was aided by regular 'contributions' given to the Pasar Minggu police station, ostensibly to help pay for operational costs and police social events. According to Aa, the initial request came from the police themselves, who complained their budget was not enough to cover basic necessities such as stationery and bottled water:

> We are more happy to be able to help our police, and even happier that they asked us over others…it shows they recognise us as their partners, and the benefits we have brought to the area.[90]

Police regularly socialise with Black Eagle members at their gardu, drinking coffee, smoking *kretek* and occasionally making lewd comments to passing women, and making very public their close relationship. Association with the Black Eagles served to undermine further the police's tenuous credibility in the area, but bolstered that of the Black Eagles. With over 300 members the Black Eagles were the largest 'security' presence in the area, and the police 'outsourced' management of day-to-day crime to them:

> It's like this; if you don't a report a crime it never happened. If you don't pay the cops then they won't do anything, plus as the saying goes, you lose a goat and report it to the police you end up losing a buffalo! So for the most part, people prefer to come to people like us to resolve a problem, and the police are content to let us handle most minor issues and petty crime. As long as we pass some money on to them and keep them informed of what we are doing, they are content to leave us to it. It's a symbiotic, mutually beneficial arrangement for all parties…a conducive situation is maintained.[91]

Through these payoffs the police acted as a layer of protection for the Black Eagles, giving advance warning of planned anti-preman campaigns and, it was rumoured, intelligence on the activities of other gangs.[92] In its management of relations with the police, other ormas and key business interests such as MetroMini, the Black Eagles built a degree of legitimacy, gaining a monopoly of sorts over protection with a minimum of violence and then applying, in relative terms, a 'reasonable' protection regime. Investing in social and political capital via payoffs to the police and donations to the broader community acted as a buffer against potential backlashes to occasional incidents of 'excess' or by those not content with the arrangement.[93] As one market vendor explained, 'they [the Black Eagles] can be harsh at times, but compared to the others they are for the most part fair…realistically we can't hope for much more than that'.[94] Paraphrasing Charles Tilly, what the Black Eagles did was to exercise strategically the *non*-use of their control of violent means (Tilly 2003, 38).

Aa's own position within the Black Eagles, however, was to come to an unexpected end. In May 2007 an FBR gardu launched an attack on a command post of the rival Betawi group, the IKB, in Kebayoran Lama, South Jakarta.[95] It was a lucrative area for the IKB, and was eyed jealously by the FBR. Rumours spread that the IKB was a front for preman from Padang, West Sumatra, turning the planned assault into not just a turf grab but a 'necessary act' in order to uphold the 'honour' of the Betawi.[96] After a tip-off of the impending raid, the IKB were able to prepare an ambush. On arrival, the two dozen FBR members were attacked from all sides, with two killed and one critically injured.[97] It was a humiliating defeat at the hands of a smaller group who were virtual 'nobodies' in the city's ormas and gang politics. The following day FBR motorbike convoys circled the area, and the

FBR's war commander Haji Amirullah issued a public ultimatum to the police to apprehend those responsible for the deaths within 12 hours, or else they would take matters into their own hands.[98]

The Southern Regional Command instructed Marta, as gardu head, to mobilise Black Eagle members to join in the planned counter-attack. Aa was expected to lead the way, and was asked to rally the most experienced fighters. However, he refused. In Aa's view, the attack had been a mistake. It did not have the support of local vendors, was poorly planned and had already resulted in the death of two FBR comrades. Putting more lives at risk, in his view, was pointless. Marta was outraged at this insubordination, perhaps also perceiving it as an attempt by Aa to undermine his authority as part of a move to replace him as gardu head.[99] Aa's ambition had been useful to Marta, but it was also threatening. It also endangered relations with the FBR hierarchy, the support of which was essential for the Black Eagles' survival. By this time Fadloli and the IKB's head had publicly expressed their regret over the incident, averting any further violence; however, this no longer mattered. Dedengkot in charge of planning the IKB reprisal attack labelled Aa a 'coward' and 'weak'.[100] Several Black Eagles close to Marta, with aspirations of their own, moved to alienate Aa further, subjecting him to verbal harassment and in one instance physical assault. The chain of command and obedience to seniority came above all, and he could not be allowed to get away with what might become a dangerous precedent. Aa's own vision for the Black Eagles collided with the interests of Marta and the political imperative of the FBR to maintain the unwavering loyalty of its franchises. He was forced to resign. Meeting him a week later, he reflected bitterly upon the experience, and what he saw as the contradictions between the organisation's rhetoric and practice:

> What I initially saw in the FBR was an opportunity to move beyond our harsh existence as preman, as predators that produced nothing and were always in trouble, and make a halal and sustainable life for ourselves and our families. That's what I was working towards with the Black Eagles. But as time went on I began to realise that we were pawns. The leadership benefit financially and politically from our hard work and us putting our lives on the line, but are ready to sacrifice us for short-term goals. In the end, the FBR has become no different from the corrupt government it claims to oppose, a vehicle for some to become powerful at the expense of ordinary people.[101]

Conclusions

The territorial expansion of ormas such as the FBR has less been due to overwhelming coercive force or violence, than the ability to sell a protection franchise effectively. By engaging in degrees of self-organisation, co-opting existing gangs, providing tangible benefits to its membership, and defending

'preman' not as criminal thugs, but as a social and economic underclass, the group expanded its constituency beyond its beginnings in the turf wars of East Jakarta, transforming into a city-wide street organisation. Rather than running parallel to 'state order', the kinds of rackets and organisations that have consolidated throughout Jakarta borrow deeply from state repertoires of strategies and practices. The racket, as an 'archetype of domination', reproduces logics of social, political and economic order familiarised by the authoritarian New Order. New Order neighbourhood-level control structures such as Siskamling have been appropriated, or perhaps rather liberalised. Insofar as the FBR provides avenues for channelling grievances and the aspirations of marginalised social and economic classes to improve conditions of material deprivation, it has done so in ways that circumvent the emergence of forms of organisation, redistribution or solidarity that may challenge the structural conditions and forces reproducing them, monopolising access to jobs and representation. Its organisational politics and logics remain embedded in patron-client relations, albeit with a greater fluidity reflective of the opportunities afforded by electoral democracy and liberalised markets.

Despite the existence of large numbers of gangs, militias and ormas aligned with various social and political interests, there has been a considerable degree of 'stability', without anything resembling the levels of violence or social disruption experienced in Rio de Janeiro, Caracas or Kingston.[102] Sustained violence as a means of gaining strategic advantage and opportunities to access resources has in-built limitations, particularly when a priority is convincing local populations of the efficacy of any protection arrangement. This also goes for political violence in the context of elections, as we shall see in Chapter 7. Government strategies have focused largely on loosely 'managing' the constellation of players, forming partnerships with the most reliable, with the police or military periodically targeting or weeding out the more 'unruly'. The most immediate risks fall upon those subject to racketeering but with little in the way of social or political capital, such as street vendors or transport workers. Here the potential threat of violence from 'loose kites', including state authorities such as the police, sustains the legitimacy of and demand for protection from sources that are known and predictable. The case of the Black Eagles points to the kinds of conditions and relationships leading to a consolidation of rackets at a local level. After achieving a degree of territorial control within the field of informal coercive players, they opted to impose what was in relative terms a 'reasonable' protection regime that was more conducive to commerce than those preceding it. This facilitated the semi-formalisation of partnerships with key stakeholders such as MetroMini and the police. They also used accumulated capital to buy or win support and legitimacy from other social and economic interests. Moving into the next chapter, we shall consider the extent to which territorial authority of this kind has translated into forms of political capital in the context of electoral democracy, the ways it has been mobilised, and on behalf of which interests.

Notes

1 Interview with gang leader, Jakarta, 2007.
2 Largely this has been in the monitoring and governance of street vendors, squatters, prostitution and public space in the context of enforcing public order laws. There have been many allegations of human rights abuses by Satpol PP in Jakarta, and of it being used as an enforcer for private interests, in particular property developers. In Jakarta the regional budget for Satpol PP was expanded significantly under Sutiyoso and later Fauzi Bowo to Rp.303 billion, far more than that allocated by the administration for education or health (Imparsial 2009).
3 As Baker (2008) has detailed, this formal separation sparked often violent turf wars between the police and the military for access and control of illegal and illicit economies.
4 *Jakarta Post* (2008) 'Residents pay up for their own peace of mind', 24 December.
5 Interview with police officer, Jakarta, September 2007.
6 *Detik* (2011) The police often mediate in territorial conflicts between groups. See for example, *Polda Metro Jaya* (2014) 'Mediasi perselisihan antara FBR dengan LMP di Polsek Kelapa Gading Jakarta Utara', 13 May, www.poldametroja ya.info/info-satwil/restro-jakut/mediasi-perselisihan-antara-fbr-dengan-lmp-di-polsek-kelapa-gading-jakarta-utara.html.
7 *Jakarta Post* (2008) '32 Hoodlums freed for lack of evidence', 22 December.
8 These were carried out in 2008, 2012 and 2013.
9 Of those arrested or detained only a small number were charged with any criminal offence.
10 There were frequent accusations of wrongful arrest with the Indonesian Legal Aid Institute (*Lembaga Bantuan Hukum*, or LBH) criticising the police for ignoring the presumption of innocence. *Tempo* (2009) 'Polisi dituduh salah tangkap preman', 5 February.
11 *Jakarta Post* (2008) 'Social center gets its share from war on thugs', 11 December.
12 During the 2005 operation complaints from the public regarding extortion and intimidation on the part of the police themselves increased by 400%, suggesting that local police took the operation as an opportunity to extract rents of their own. *Jakarta Post* (2005), 'Number of thugs down, number of bad cops up', 19 September.
13 Coming largely from middle-class activists, this was less to do with their street-level presence and more so involvement in high-profile political campaigns such as aggressive support for controversial anti-pornography legislation (Wilson 2008).
14 Formulated by the New Order regime during the 1980s, the law was introduced in order to strengthen authoritarian controls over society by requiring all civil organisations to register with the Ministry of Home Affairs. Law No.8/1985 contains three provisions by which an organisation can be forcibly disbanded: when the organisation disturbs public order; when the organisation receives foreign funding without government approval; or when it receives foreign assistance that in any way undermines the interests of the nation and state.
15 An amended version was eventually passed in 2013. See Wilson and Nugroho 2012.
16 *Tempo* (2010) 'Geng reman Van Jakarta', 15 November. The claims by national police chief Bambang Danuri that 'preman berdasi' (preman wearing ties) and backers of gangsters in the military and police would also be targeted did not eventuate. See also *Media Indonesia* (2008) 'Jenderal beking preman akan diumumkan', 28 November.

17 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2007.
18 *Tempo* (2008) 'Tokoh Betawi minta pemerintah Jakarta bina preman', 13 November.
19 This saw the FBR establish new branches in Kebayoran, while Forkabi made inroads into North Jakarta, and the Body for Guiding the Potential of the Greater Banten Family (*Badan Pembinaan Potensi Keluarga Besar Banten*, or BPPKB) absorbed some smaller gangs in Tanjung Priok, Jakarta's harbour district.
20 *Jakarta Post* (2009) 'New underworld: brain over brawn', 28 August. One aspect of this has been steady flows of members from one group to another based on wavering fortunes and perceptions of strength. It's not unusual for someone to hold memberships of two or more groups, even though all groups strictly prohibit this.
21 Interview with Abraham Lunggana, Jakarta, 2010. Through his networks in the PPP and as a member of the regional parliament, Lulung was of course well placed to sell his services to a different well-heeled clientele.
22 Interview, Jakarta, 2010.
23 *Jakarta Post* (2011) 'Hard-line Betawi groups claim role in creating a "safer" Jakarta', 17 December.
24 One vendor explained that he 'rented' an FBR flag from the local branch in order to protect him from eviction or arrest, but was not a member of the group, or a supporter. 'I do it to keep my business safe, that's it.' Interview, Jakarta, 2008.
25 Interview with Lufti Hakim, Jakarta, 2010.
26 The legal aid division is staffed by law graduates from various universities throughout the city.
27 Amirullah's background is in the world of pencak silat, and like Fadloli he is believed to possess ilmu kebal, the magical power of invulnerability to sharp weapons, something regularly demonstrated at performances at FBR events. See Wilson 2012.
28 As full-time employees of the organisation they receive a regular salary together with a mobile phone and in some cases a motorbike or even a car.
29 Interview with Amirullah, Jakarta, 2009. In this instance they were local preman paid by a textile business owner concerned the FBR would be an expensive nuisance if allowed to get established in the area.
30 Interview with Amirullah, Jakarta, 2009.
31 The FBR also has dedicated 'intelligence agents' known as *intek-intek*, who are assigned to monitor rivals and gather information on matters of strategic or political importance to the organisation. This is a common feature in many ormas.
32 The Jakarta regional police have regularly requested that the Jakarta administration 'regulate' ormas posts built on public land, due to them being obstructions and also 'triggers for conflict'. At the local level, however, police regularly hang out at posko, use them as sources of intelligence, and coordinate with ormas in neighbourhood security matters. *DKI News* (2012) 'Polda desak Pemprov DKI bongkar posko dan gardu ormas', 3 July.
33 In more than a few instances, gardu I visited were for the most part largely unoccupied and in disrepair. In others, gardu had well in excess of 300 members.
34 Ondel-ondel are large puppets meant to represent spiritual ancestors of the Betawi, which are worn over the head as part of a folk dance performance. Onde-ondel are incorporated into the logo of the FBR.
35 Unlike some ormas or gangs, the FBR has not experienced any significant internal factionalism. The strength of its institutionalisation can be seen in the smooth and unanimous appointment of Hakim to the leadership in the wake of Fadloli's unexpected death. At times when leadership decisions have been

unpopular, in particular in relation to preferred political candidates, the response has been less revolt, than to politely ignore it.

36 Castells (2009, 8) defines 'legitimizing identity' as '[a] set of logic and meaning introduced and propagated by the ruling powers, in order to rationalize, reproduce, and expand existing rule', whereas 'resistance identity' is 'constructed in response to devaluation and stigmatization; where social actors build "trenches of resistance" in opposition to the ruling norm'.

37 Drawn from field notes, Jakarta, 27 August 2005.

38 Interview with Bang Ucu, Jakarta, 2009.

39 *Tempo* (2013) 'Penertiban Waduk Ria Rio, Posko FBR tetap berdiri', 20 November.

40 The RT/RW system divides neighbourhoods by household unit. An RT consists of between 30–50 households, whereas an RW is made up of a number of RT.

41 At a meeting of senior FBR I was told that a Betawi was 'someone whose fate is tied to Jakarta. Who lives here, works here, and the products of whose work stays in Jakarta, rather than being sent somewhere else'.

42 Modified non-Muslim versions of the FBR *bai'at*oath were also developed. At FBR mass events, where anywhere between 2,000–7,000 could be in attendance, the group's 'openness to all' was displayed by having 'friends' and 'honorary members' from various ethnic and religious communities standing on stage next to the chairman.

43 Interview with Lutfi Hakim, Jakarta, 2012.

44 Interview with Kei clan member, Jakarta, 2007.

45 *Kompas* (2014) 'Antara Ayung, John Kei, Said Kei, dan Ongen Sangaji', 29 February. Rumours abounded that Tito Kei was shot by the military, who had decided the Kei clan had 'overstepped their bounds' one too many times and needed to be finished off.

46 *Tempo* (2012) 'Peristiwa kekerasan yang melibatkan Pemuda Kei', 19 February. The West Jakarta police formed a special 'preman hunter team' specifically targeting Hercules's gang. After his arrest in 2012, they claimed that incidents of organised premanisme, contrasted against premanisme caused by 'economic hardship', had dropped significantly. *Tribun News* (2014) 'Hercules ditangkap, premanisme di Jakarta Barat menurun', 13 February.

47 Interview with Abraham Lunggana, Jakarta, 2010. Sangaji was murdered by members of John Kei's gang in apparent revenge for the murder by Sangaji of Kei's younger brother.

48 See for example, *Sindo News* (2013) 'Bentrok PP vs FBR dipicu penurunan umbul-umbul', 16 June; and *Kompas* (2012) 'FBR dan Pemuda Pancasila bentrok di Mampang', 28 January.

49 Interview with gang member, Jakarta, 2012.

50 One senior BPPKB member remarked that many younger men join to get backup in 'petty squabbles'. 'One came to us after he was slapped by some dude, demanding we send a group with machetes to wreak revenge. We told him to be a man and go sort it out himself. Nowadays the young want to be respected without doing anything to be respected for. In the organisation we try and keep a cap on this.' Interview with BPPKB member, Jakarta, 2010.

51 Interview with police colonel, Jakarta, 2009.

52 *Okezone News* (2011) 'Polda Metro: ormas sering jadi sumber masalah', 13 December.

53 Lutfi Hakim, for example, has expelled several 'rogue members' involved in violence. In other instances conflicts have claimed to be the result of 'provocateurs' infiltrating the organisation. The leaders of major ormas in the city regularly host 'goodwill' meetings (*silaturahmi*) to smooth over tensions. It was repeatedly emphasised to me that there are 'no hostilities' between leaders and that conflicts

are the result of 'overly emotional' grass-roots members. Despite these claims, there are strong enmities at the grass roots between several ormas, such as the FBR and PP.

54 Debt collectors are used across the spectrum of business and enterprise from small credit agencies and individual lenders to major financial institutions such as international banks. In the words of one Jakarta debt collector, 'the reason people come to us is that we'll get the job done. The formal system is slow, corrupt and expensive. You might be owed how many dollars, but end up paying twice that to recover it, if you ever do. We make things work. Some might consider us criminal, but without us business would come to a standstill'. Interview, Jakarta, 2012. The use of violent debt collection practices by major financial institutions came to light in 2011 after the death of politician Irzen Octa, allegedly at the hands of debt collectors hired by Citibank. Octa had gone to a Citibank branch office to discuss the repayment terms of an US$11,000 credit card debt. Several debt collectors were charged over the death, but no Citibank employees. *Jakarta Post* (2011) 'BI: stop using debt collectors', 2 April.

55 In 2013, for example, the administration of Joko Widodo oversaw the eviction of over 13,000 people ostensibly as part of flood alleviation efforts, despite an election platform in which kampung dwellers were promised they would be exempted.

56 Hercules's group, for example, has negotiated significant shares in contested land, later, and with some 'encouragement', buying out the partner. Recovery of significant debts can also entail taking ownership of the debtor's assets by debt collectors, including land. A number of billiards halls in central Jakarta run by eastern Indonesian gangs were obtained in this way.

57 See for example, *Sindo News* (2012) 'Berebut lahan, DBR dan FKPPB bentrok di Cakung', 2 November; and *Pos Kota* (2013) 'Meraup rupiah di tanah sengketa', 22 September.

58 For example, in April 2014 members of Hercules's gang occupied a disputed property on behalf of their boss who was due to be evicted after the court decided in favour of the rival claimant. Faced with 400 preman, the municipal police opted to negotiate a postponement of the eviction rather than deal with inevitable violence. *Liputan6* (2014) 'Kampus Santa Mary gagal dieksekusi', 24 April.

59 See for example, *Detik* (2012) 'Khawatir digusur, warga Puri Intan Tangerang ajak FBR berjaga', 9 February; and *Vivanews* (2012) 'Penggusuran pedagang, FBR datangi stasiun Depok Baru', 17 December.

60 Other ormas that have mobilised on behalf of poor and working-class neighbourhoods in eviction cases in Jakarta include Forkabi, the FPI and BPPKB. This is often given 'free of charge'.

61 Interview with FBR member, Jakarta, 2007.

62 The children of deceased members who have no immediate next of kin are taken in by the orphanage and educated in the pesantren.

63 These programmes are developed and run by the director of the FBR's training and development association (*Latpesdam*), Edwin Hamidy, a lawyer specialising in industrial relations and corporate dispute law.

64 There have been many cases of new FBR gardu being burnt down.

65 The FBR is, like most ormas, an overwhelmingly male organisation. The FBR does have a dedicated 'women's division', which consists largely of the wives or girlfriends of male members. A number of women are gardu heads, with at least two women pendekar.

66 Political parties or candidates can pay anywhere from Rp. 25–100,000 per head in addition to food, transportation and a campaign t-shirt. Members and the poor more generally regularly do the rounds during campaign periods, attending rallies from as many paying parties as possible.

67 *RMOL.CO* (2012) 'Jakarta provincial government fails to overcome unemployment', 17 February.
68 Setting up roadblocks to collect 'entrance fees' at a number of industrial parks was another means.
69 See *Kompas* (2002) 'FBR bantah Tarik dana dari pengusaha', 9 April.
70 In some cases this is to replace or in addition to a budget to hire a security company or ormas to keep preman at bay.
71 *Detik* (2004) 'FBR blokir ITC Cempaka Mas', 13 October.
72 *Okezone.com* (2011) 'Ketua FBR: teman-teman hanya meminta lapangan kerja', 24 June.
73 Outsourced workers commonly wear uniforms that identify their labour agent. Those outsourced from the FBR wear black long-sleeved t-shirts emblazoned with its logo.
74 *Republika* (2013) 'Buruh RI mengadu ke serikat buruh internasional soal kasus kekerasan', 5 November.
75 *Lensa Indonesia* (2011) 'Anggota FBR diberi peluang kerja di Jepang', 4 November.
76 Via this connection, the FBR was offered 400 training and job placements for its members through the department.
77 Interview with PD Pasar Jaya official, Jakarta, 2008. The market specialises in fruit and vegetables as well as cheap clothing.
78 Interview with store owner, Pasar Minggu, 2008.
79 Interview with store owner, Pasar Minggu, 2007.
80 Born in 1970, Aa's father was a *bajaj* driver (a three-wheeled diesel-engine taxi), while his mother was a door-to-door vegetable seller. Forced to leave school aged 12 due to lack of money, he spent his time hanging around the market. By his late teens he was a regular Pasar Minggu fixture, and eked out a living as security for warung remang-remang. Regularly enjoying the free alcohol made available to him, he developed a reputation as a brave fighter, but with a short temper, who would dish out beatings to any troublesome customers.
81 Interview with Aa, Jakarta, 2006.
82 Interview with Marta, Jakarta, 2008.
83 When asked why, several men who defected from the Batak gang and Pemuda Pancasila suggested it was to do with FBR 'having a name' (*punya nama*) and being 'the strongest' (*paling kuat*), the implication being that this would afford greater opportunities for a secure position in the local protection economy, as well as increasing their own security from attacks from rivals, including the gangs they had left.
84 A number of the Madurese gang later joined the Black Eagles; however, the majority either moved elsewhere or abandoned gang life. Several now run a tyre-repair stall next to the terminal.
85 How they secured this prime piece of real estate was never explained. A vendor said it was the former site of a Sisikamling post of which the FBR had taken ownership with the support of the police.
86 Interview with Aa, Jakarta, 2007.
87 *Tempo* (2012) 'Pungli angkutan umum capai Rp.25 triliun', 14 February.
88 Interview with Marta, Jakarta, 2007.
89 According to Aa, this was largely confined to new vendors who 'had yet to recognise our existence'.
90 According to data provided by the Pasar Minggu police, the station received Rp.16 million per month from the government for operational costs in 2006, increasing to Rp.24 million in 2008.
91 Interview with Aa, Jakarta, 2007.
92 *Tempo* (2005) 'Cara Operasi Polsek Pasar Minggu Agar Tak Bocor', 12 August.

93 This included brawls between members, beatings of vendors who refused to pay fees, and one incident in which a local youth was hit with a pole after being mistaken for a thief.
94 Confidential interview, Pasar Minggu, 2008.
95 IKB has around 3000 members city-wide, who also make a living through protection rackets based in similar claims of representing the Betawi.
96 Interview with Siwo Wekan, Jakarta, 2007.
97 *Detik* (2007) 'Pasar Kebayoran Lama jadi sepi pasca bentrokan FBR-IKB', 25 May.
98 *Detik* (2007) 'FBR ultimatum polisi 1 x 12 jam temukan pembacok 2 rekannya', 22 May.
99 Interview with Marta, Jakarta, 2008.
100 Interview with Siwo Wekan, Jakarta, 2007.
101 Interview with Aa, Jakarta, June 2007. By early 2008 he and his family had moved out of Pasar Minggu.
102 This can also be attributed in part to the relatively low levels of firearm possession in Jakarta.

7 Coercive capital, political entrepreneurship and electoral democracy

In the previous chapter an outline of the political economy of rackets operating in Jakarta revealed a messy and complex field of interests competing for rents, territory and legitimacy. In this chapter we shall address the question of how this limited territorial and coercive power and authority, as an actual set of practices, organisational and transactional strategies, has translated into or been used as political capital in the context of multi-party legislative elections, and direct elections for governors and the presidency in Jakarta. During the New Order, the coercive capacity of state-backed youth groups and preman was mobilised during periodic 'festivals of democracy' to ensure support for the ruling party, Golkar. The end of the regime saw a liberalisation of the political system, and also of its former henchmen and enforcers with political party paramilitary groups, ethnic and religious militias, vigilantes and a range of violent entrepreneurs competing for patronage, constituencies and rackets. Alongside this was the emergence of more professional and also populist forms of organisation seeking to provide employment for their members. Many former New Order strongmen or those with a background in the world of preman were able to use their experience and networks to become regional and national parliamentarians, as Ryter (2009) has detailed. Contesting seats in regional or national parliaments has not been the central preoccupation of many of the largest organisations in Jakarta. The FPI's leadership has in fact turned down offers of party nominations for the legislature, while the FBR has focused on securing informal power and authority at the local level which it has then used to bargain and broker various concessions and deals on behalf of its membership. Their concern is not with seizing or 'capturing' formal political power, either democratically or otherwise.

It has become something of a truism in the Indonesian media to suggest that preman and those organisations associated with them work on behalf of various political elite 'backers', but what exactly do these 'alliances' entail, and what material or political benefits do they bring to both parties? Is coercive muscle in a now well-institutionalised electoral democracy still an effective means of securing power and economic interests? If not, what is the appeal or use value to political parties and politicians of courting the support of organisations widely perceived as being sources of criminality and violence? In considering these questions, the chapter will examine several different

'engagements' between ormas, violent entrepreneurs and democratic electoral politics. It is suggested that while at times reproducing a New Order role as subcontracted agents mobilising on behalf of elite interests and as a mechanism of local-level social and political control, they have also been highly proficient and entrepreneurial practitioners of populist democratic politics, albeit in ways that do not constitute a fundamental oppositional challenge to the state or entrenched interests.

After considering the rise and fall of the influence of political party paramilitaries, the chapter then examines the engagement of the FBR in Jakarta's politics, in particular its relationship with city's governors. Despite rejecting democracy as *haram*, it is argued that the FPI have nonetheless proven adept at playing a particular kind of reactionary and instrumentalist politics shaped by the broader framework of Indonesia's decentralised electoral system and aligned themselves with broader forces seeking to roll back moves towards more liberal democracy. The chapter ends with an examination of the re-emergence of Hercules on the national political stage in the lead-up to the 2014 presidential election, as a key component of the 'counter-insurgency'-type campaigning of his former military backer, New Order strongman and presidential candidate Prabowo Subianto.

Party paramilitaries

As was described at the beginning of the book, in the lead-up to Indonesia's first post-New Order election in 1999, satgas paramilitary units became a highly visible street-level presence, a hybrid of multi-party democracy, New Order militarism and the logics of turf of the preman who filled their ranks. With military-style uniforms and territorial command structures, satgas were the equivalent of a 'standing army' for their respective political parties, of which there were 48 by the time of the 1999 election.[1] New parties such as the PDI-P claimed these paramilitary units were a necessary defence against attack from forces attached to well-entrenched players such as Golkar. They worked as security for events such as campaign rallies and party conventions, bodyguards for senior party members, and as grass-roots cadres were tasked with disseminating party news at the local level. However, satgas were soon embroiled in more familiar kinds of political thuggery such as assaulting journalists, attacking political rivals, or intimidating neighbourhoods to vote for their party. During the period May 2000 to April 2001, for example, the Indonesian Independent Journalists Alliance recorded dozens of instances of violence against the press by satgas linked to the National Awakening Party (*Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa*, or PKB) of then President Abdurrahman Wahid (Solahdin et al. 2001).[2] Satgas quickly grew in size in what King (2003) called a 'party arms race', with the PDI-P claiming over 30,000 by 2001 on top of a plethora of 'supporter' organisations.

Local preman, jago and disenfranchised urban youth flooded to join satgas, recognising them as the new organisational vehicles for securing turf and

access to resources and patronage, displacing the former regime-affiliated organisations such as Pemuda Pancasila, which struggled to redefine themselves.[3] There were mass migrations of members to those parties that it was believed would win power (Ryter 2005). Political parties also actively recruited from amongst the ranks of urban underclasses, framed as a means of engaging with the *rakyat kecil* or 'common folk' whose interests they claimed to represent and defend, hoping that the informal leaders could shape community voting patterns.[4]

In Central Java and East Java, in particular, satgas rivalries were intense and violent, electoral politics playing out in conflicts over turf, constituencies and informal markets (King 2003). In Jakarta the impact of satgas as a source of political violence was relatively limited compared to other parts of the country, although the presence of large numbers of Banser and Ansor from the provinces at parliamentary sessions prior to President Wahid's impeachment was a source of considerable tension, galvanising Betawi jago to 'secure the city', as discussed in Chapter 4.[5] Where their presence was more acutely felt was as new strategically positioned players in the market for securing contracts and protection rents. As MacDougall (2003) has detailed, illicit businesses such as gambling, or those potentially subject to police raids such as bars or clubs, were inclined to seek protection from those perceived as having more direct links to politicians and those capable of providing high-level patronage. During the presidency of Abdurrahman Wahid (1999–2001) and Megawati (2001–04) the satgas of their respective parties made significant inroads into protection markets previously dominated by military-linked groups such as Pemuda Pancasila. They also preyed upon the insecurities of religious and ethnic minorities in the capital. For example, in the wake of the 2000 Christmas Eve church bombings, Banser approached Christian communities throughout the city to offer 'protection' for a fee, whereas PDI-P satgas targeted Chinese-owned business and storeowners still traumatised by the anti-Chinese violence of 1998 (Salim 2004).[6]

Satgas were also largely outside the control of the military or the police, something that by 2003 was causing increasing unease amongst the military hierarchy.[7] Unlike their New Order-period equivalents, satgas were not concerned with the defence of the state, but of their own party's interests. Neither the police nor the military had effective means or resources to control satgas, which challenged not only their authority through the replication of military-style aesthetics, but also had cut into their segment of protection markets. The head of the armed forces, General Endriartono Sutarto, along with other senior military figures, publicly expressed concern at the proliferation and apparent 'lawlessness' of party satgas, calling for their disbandment.[8] The PDI-P rejected this, insisting that it was an internal party matter and that the military should 'butt out' of party politics. At the same time, however, serving or retired military officers, who had also flocked to join the new political parties, were frequently in charge of training or leading satgas units.

While satgas such as Banser constituted a significant social base of party support for the PKB in its stronghold areas in East Java, drawing heavily upon pesantren and pencak silat networks such as the Nahadatul Ulama-affiliated Pagar Nusa silat school, this was less so in Jakarta, where satgas units were filled for the most part by opportunists.[9] The PDI-P, in particular, was faced with a large and fractious array of satgas and militant supporter groups, increasingly engaged in in-fighting over turf or embroiled in internal factional rivalries for party branch leadership positions. Many morphed into private security companies that used party symbols to secure contracts and jobs on behalf of clients, but with no connection to the party structure or leadership.[10] The PDI-P leadership made token efforts to 'clean up' the image of their satgas and the growing perception of it as a 'party of preman' with directives to expel members involved in thuggery or racketeering.[11] Yet this was destined to fail, in part due to a fundamental misunderstanding of why the urban underclass signed up. Designated as 'volunteers', satgas received no salary and were officially prohibited from soliciting or accepting work on behalf of private clients in their status as party functionaries. They were meant to be loyal, selfless party servants. Without any income from the party, however, and with many either unemployed or with precarious work in the informal sector, it was unsurprising that they used the social and political capital of the symbols and reputation of the party as a means for livelihood generation.

By the time of the 2004 national election the political use value of satgas had declined considerably. Outbreaks of violence were increasingly counter-productive in the face of intensive media scrutiny and a public electorally sensitive to parties seen to be instigating street violence or incapable of controlling their supporters. Satgas did not help get people or parties elected, though some individual satgas did manage to move up the party hierarchy. In the end it was regulations introduced by the Indonesian Electoral Commission (*Komisi Pemilihan Umum*, or KPU) prior to the 2004 elections which proved the most efficient mechanism for curtailing their street-level presence. KPU Decision No. 7/2004 set strict limitations on the mobilisation of satgas during campaign periods and also banned the establishment of satgas command posts which had proliferated throughout the city, with threats of party deregistration for those who failed to comply.

With little or no loyalty to the party as an ideological or political vehicle, the reduced utility of satgas resulted in another mass jumping ship to other organisations that were better placed to benefit from the shifting political climate, such as ethnic or religious militia. For parties and candidates themselves, communal identity organisations with deeper roots in the kampung emerged as potentially more strategic partners in securing local support. If there was a lesson to be taken from the satgas by ormas such as the FBR, however, it was to not put all their eggs in one political basket. Displays of party loyalty were replaced by far more tactical, contingent and pragmatic politicking.

Playing the field: FBR and elections in Jakarta

> Effectively there is no real political opposition in Indonesia such as we see in Europe or the US. The parties are solely concerned with securing power, and not in representing a constituency. What we want is direct participation and representation, not simply to be mobilised on behalf of such and such a party.[12]

This desire for 'direct participation and representation' as stated by Lutfi Hakim has played out in fragmented and frequently shifting alliances between the FBR, political parties and aspirants for the governorship of Jakarta, combined with efforts to win election to non-party-partisan positions in the regional administration. As the secretary-general of the FBR explained, 'our initial stage was to develop an extensive grass-roots network throughout Jakarta. Having done this, we've now reached the second stage in our organisation's development, which is getting members into formal political institutions'.[13] The FBR has approached this 'second stage' mission on two fronts. The first has been at the neighbourhood level of the RT and RW. Here, as discussed in Chapter 6, it has had considerable success with significant numbers elected, enabling local branches to secure monopolies over local informal markets and become gatekeepers for political parties and other interests seeking to garner support, all done while drawing a government salary. However, this was not an outcome of an ability to coerce residents, but was underpinned by hopes for some degree of representation or protection. In several poor neighbourhoods with RT or RW from FBR, such as Pedongkelan and Muara Angke, residents interviewed stated that links to ormas were preferred as it was believed they offered a source of backup and a protective network in the face of threats of eviction or raids by Satpol PP.[14] These local administrative positions are politically significant, as outside the governor, RT and RW are the only ones subject to direct election. Unlike the rest of the country, village chiefs (*lurah*) and mayors (*wali kota*) in Jakarta are appointed directly by the regional government.[15] The predominance of RT and RW linked to ormas or identified as 'preman' ruffled the feathers of Deputy Governor Basuki Purnama, who suggested that the solution to this 'hijacking' should be to remove direct elections entirely and return to the New Order practice of direct appointment.[16] The aggressive campaign of evictions of his administration had politicised ormas in unexpected ways, with the FBR and other ormas not infrequently at the front line of resistance.

The second front of the FBR's campaign for representation has been the Regional Representative Council (*Dewan Perwakilan Daerah* or DPD). The DPD is a non-party-partisan body which has the power to propose bills to and review bills before the regional parliament. Candidates often have party financial backing, but they do not require party nomination. Fadloli had run in 2004, coming sixth out of 38 candidates, with 5.05% of the vote.[17] Running again in 2009, he died of heart failure just weeks before the election, still managing to win several thousand votes. Hakim continued this tradition in

the 2014 elections, with 5.7%.[18] Hakim's loss was a great disappointment to many in the FBR who were convinced that the organisation was now an 'electoral powerhouse'. However, it served more broadly, as had previous DPD results, as an advertisement of the potential of the organisation to attract a not insignificant number of votes, which in turn could be used as bargaining power in transactional politics with political parties, legislative candidates and governors. As Hakim explained, 'we ran a low-budget campaign without party or corporate backing, so the result is indicative of our grass-roots popularity and potential. That's a clear victory for us'.[19]

The FBR has long complained about the absence of direct elections for mayors in the capital, viewing it as a position the organisation could successfully contest in its stronghold areas in the east and north of Jakarta.[20] It has also called for the introduction of local political parties.[21] Unlike ormas such as Forkabi that have retained a close relationship with PAN, the FBR has remained reluctant to form anything resembling an ongoing alliance with political parties, preferring to broker pre-election deals.[22] In many respects it has consciously played the parties, using perceptions of its size and influence in Jakarta's kampung and an awareness of the estrangement of the parties from this level of society, to its strategic advantage. For example, prior to the 2009 legislative elections PAN cut a deal with the FBR leadership whereby one of its candidates, Andi Azhar, would be appointed to the FBR advisory board in return for the organisation's support. Son of former Indonesian National Military (*Tentara Nasional Indonesia*, or TNI) Lieutenant-General and Habibie administration Attorney-General Andi Ghalib, Azhar runs a string of businesses including a coal mining company in Kalimantan, which provided new labour outsourcing opportunities for the FBR as well as an advocate in parliament in the face of periodic calls for it to be disbanded.

With the backing of the city's two largest Betawi organisations seemingly secured, the PAN was publicly confident it would increase its six seats in the Jakarta regional parliament.[23] However, things did not go according to plan and its overall vote took a significant dive, losing two seats. While taking part in public campaigning for the PAN, internally the directive to FBR members was to follow their regional commanders who had brokered individual deals with a number of different parties.[24] This was intended to 'maximise potential overall gains for the organisation', a strategy also increasingly used by trade unions such as the FSPMI.[25] The exception was in Central Jakarta, where Andi Azhar was running, where the order was that 'FBR solidarity must prevail'.[26] PAN again sought FBR support in the 2014 legislative elections as part of its strategy to 'establish networks down to the RT level'.[27] Flopping electorally once more, the party's combined overall vote in Jakarta was less than that won by Lutfi Hakim in his DPD bid.

While it is difficult to say whether or not ormas support translates into votes and, if so, whether it is in sufficient numbers to affect the result, it does pose the question: what is the appeal to political parties? As the case of the satgas indicates, coercive capacity is no longer an effective electoral strategy

and can in fact quickly undermine public support, particularly in Jakarta. In relation to the FBR there appear to be several key explanations. One is a simple case of having a ready mass to mobilise for public events such as rallies and convoys, in a context where 'shows of force' still constitute a key part of electoral campaigns. Parties regularly do 'package deals' with various organisations in return for bussed-in masses, who are given cash, a meal and a free t-shirt.[28] Post-election, ormas can offer protection or provide competitive advantage for the various business interests of party officials, providing jobs and the securing of 'projects' for the FBR.[29] Attempts to attach themselves to the networks of the FBR could, in the party's mind, substitute for the absence of any kind of local-level presence. A party official might get little attention, particularly in poor neighbourhoods where political parties are often held in contempt as corrupt and self-serving, but a respected or feared jago who knows the neighbourhood intimately is likely to have far more influence. With an acute awareness that they are perceived to possess precisely that which the parties so desperately desire, the FBR has been emboldened to play the field. Money politics, and vote buying in particular, poses a greater risk to those attempting to buy than to those being 'bought' in the absence of effective means to monitor or enforce any agreement. Unlike in Bulgaria or Sicily where vote buying is carefully managed in order to ensure compliance, in Indonesia it is largely based in 'good faith'.[30] Aspinall (2014) has detailed some of the array of tactics used by candidates, from gift giving, donations to community facilities, and promises of investment in local infrastructure and the distribution of favours if elected. After the results of the 2014 legislative election, for example, there were numerous reports of indignant losing candidates demanding that gifts and cash be returned, to the bemusement, or irritation, of the recipients.[31] The ability of ormas or local preman in Jakarta to deliver results to patrons is also limited by the same dynamics. Ormas leaders can pledge their organisation's 'full support', but in practice there is little to prevent members voting in accord with their own conscience or accepting inducements from other candidates, which internally is often encouraged. As one FBR member said, 'all the politicians and parties are rich, so why not?'[32]

The FBR has played a similar game in its relationships with Jakarta's governors. Its early support for Sutiyoso had contradicted its pro-Betawi stance, putting it at odds with other Betawi organisations. It also failed to bear the hoped for results. Once it became clear that Sutiyoso would not become a reliable patron, they retracted support.[33] With the end of Sutiyoso's second term in 2007, his deputy, Fauzi Bowo, a Betawi, was poised to take his place.[34] A key platform of the FBR had been that Jakarta should be led by a 'native son'; however, weeks from Jakarta's first direct election for governor it retracted its support for Bowo, instead backing former national Deputy Police Chief Adang Daradjatun. While publicly it declared that Bowo had failed to tackle chronic problems such as flooding and traffic congestion, Fadloli felt he had been sidelined for the chairmanship of Bamus by Bowo, a position which, as the head of the largest Betawi organisation, he believed was

rightfully his.[35] Daradjatun also offered access to different, potentially lucrative networks, particularly with the higher echelons of the police.[36] The Laskar Jayakarta, a rival Betawi militia led by police detective Susilowadi, had largely outmanoeuvred the FBR in contracts for security in nightlife districts such as Tamansari, and was a preferred partner of the police in security for public events, of which the FBR was deeply envious.[37]

Fauzi Bowo easily won the 2007 election with 58% of the vote, but despite the FBR's snub, sought to regain its favour.[38] It remained in his interests to keep them on side, as much due to the potential they held for creating disruption. Through Bowo's twin roles as head of the Bamus advisory board and Jakarta's governor, he sought to secure political support through the distribution of favours and funds. Regional budget grant funds (*dana hibah*) in particular, which can be allocated on the discretion of the governor and are not subject to audit, were dispersed to Bamus and a range of youth organisations with close links to government, such as Karung Taruna and the KNPI.[39] Indonesian Corruption Watch identified a doubling of grant funds in the 2011 Jakarta regional budget.[40] Along with social assistance funds (*dana bantuan sosial*), these have been a key tool of regional leaders through which to develop patronage networks (Djani, Masduki and Wilson 2009). Aside from hibah funds via Bamus, the FBR gained contracts and jobs for city events, and was frequently endorsed by Bowo, who proclaimed it an 'asset to the city' in 'maintaining security'.[41] Despite the flow of benefits and compliments from the governor, in late 2011 the FBR once more withdrew its support for his election bid.[42] This time it was part of a game play to force him to take on former Betawi General Nachrowi Ramli, the FBR's preferred candidate and an advisory board member, as his deputy.[43] With Bamus the foundation for mobilising his core voting base, and having invested significantly and potentially scandalously in it, Bowo was sensitive to dissent from its largest and most outspoken member. Whether or not it was due to pressure from the FBR or political parties remains unclear, but Bowo capitulated.

Bowo lost the governorship, and with it the FBR lost a key patron. The election of Joko Widodo posed a new set of challenges. Requests by Betawi ormas for special consideration gained little traction, particularly as many had engaged in an aggressive ethnicised smear campaign against him. Widodo moved to distance the office of the governor from Bamus. Hercules also appeared at several of Widodo's campaign events, and his organisation, the People's Movement for a New Indonesia (*Gerakan Rakyat Indonesia Baru* or GRIB), mobilised to monitor ballot stations at the request of Gerindra, the party of his former military backer Prabowo Subianto.[44] This served to aggravate Betawi groups further, fearing it signalled Hercules's political party-backed return to the forefront of Jakarta gang politics.[45] Attempts by the FBR to secure work contracts for new transport infrastructure projects were also rejected by the administration as 'uncompetitive'.[46] Another perceived snub came in March 2014, when Widodo declared his candidacy for the

presidency from the home of Si Pitung, the legendary Betawi social bandit with whom the FBR identified.[47] It seemed the days of privileged access to the governor were, for now at least, over. Even in the face of the recurring defeat of its preferred candidates, however, its chairman, Lutfi Hakim, remained philosophical:

> We are strong enough that we can ride any change of political leadership. And in the end of the day we will work with whoever is in power, as we respect democracy and the constitution. The ultimate success is that elections in Jakarta have been safe, without riots or chaos. The city can thank us for that.[48]

Whether this claimed role in safeguarding the democratic process was as a protector from unnamed forces that threatened to disrupt it, or as the potential source of disruption itself, was something Lutfi Hakim left unanswered. Part of the FBR's power perhaps derives from this ambiguity.

Capturing the politics of resentment: morality racketeering and the FPI

If the FBR has been able to use perceptions of its grass-roots 'embeddedness' in Jakarta kampung and its claim to represent poor Betawi to good effect in brokering deals with political parties and elites, Islamist vigilantes such as the FPI have deployed a different array of strategies to leverage influence. Formed in 1997 and led by *habib* religious scholars, the FPI emerged on the public stage in the tumultuous period surrounding the end of the New Order regime, first making itself known as part of the Pamswakarsa, irregular militias drawn from the ranks of the urban poor and various New Order youth groups mobilised by Armed Forces Chief General Wiranto and Police Chief Noegroho Djajoesman as a 'third force' against the student-led reform movement.[49] Soon afterwards, in November 1998, in Ketapang, Central Jakarta, the FPI led an attack on a stronghold of Ambonese gangsters, with 15 dying as a result. Ostensibly a response to the damaging of a mosque, it also took down a well-established gambling den, signalling a shakeup of Jakarta's underworld economy.[50] Widely circulated images of robe-clad vigilantes armed with clubs and machetes, beating and beheading local gangsters, both horrified and enthralled. The FPI emerged as a new force in the streets, fighting not for money, turf or political patronage, but the defence of Islam.

The FPI's ostensive mission has been to enforce the Quranic edict of *amar makruf nahi mungkar*, 'commanding the good, forbidding the bad', which has entailed protecting the Islamic community from the perceived dangers of moral licentiousness and vice (*maksiat*) that are rhetorically linked to liberal democracy, secularism and economic liberalisation, together with the threat posed to the integrity of the faith by the presence of 'deviationist' minority religious groups, such as the Ahmadiyah sect or followers of Shiite Islam.[51] While frequently operating in defiance of state interests and the law, the FPI

has also been a crucial element of the ruling strategies of local political elites, and as power brokers in their own right, sometimes in open conflict with the formal authorities at others, working in 'partnership' in the maintenance of particular kinds of social order. The FPI operates on two distinct fronts. The first is at the level of the 'spectacular': orchestrated actions and campaigns through which the FPI leadership seeks to maximise its public profile and tap into broader conservative opinion, using this to leverage concessions and patronage from elites, increasing its authority as a 'legitimate' voice for the *ummah*, or Islamic community of believers. Examples include its campaign for the Sutiyoso administration to impose tighter restrictions on nightlife opening hours during the fasting month of Ramadan, influencing anti-pornography and anti-alcohol legislation, and strong-arming government into banning a number of cultural and musical events, such as the Jakarta concert of US pop star Lady Gaga.[52] It has been able to 'punch above its weight' for a relatively small and frequently violent organisation, and integrate into and become a shaper of national discourses and debates over the place of Islam in Indonesia's social and political life. The other front is in everyday politics of urban life in Jakarta, where it has carved out a niche for itself by intentionally prising open socioeconomic tensions and instigating moral panics through which it has sought to situate itself as a broker.

US diplomatic cables from 2006 released by WikiLeaks outlined what many had long suspected. Former national Chief of Police Sutanto was on the record stating that the FPI was perennially useful as an 'attack dog' when needed, and that as such regularly received funding from the police and State Intelligence Service.[53] However, the ability of the police to control this attack dog was limited, with one of its early benefactors, former Police Chief Noegroho Djajoesman, stating that by 2001 the 'leash' had broken and the group had moved beyond direct control.[54] Nonetheless, the FPI remained periodically useful for reshaping the balance of power in the political economy of street-level authority, while for the FPI, collaboration with the police served to legitimate further its anti-vice stance.

It became a new player in the city's complex protection economy, utilising defence of the faith as a means to extract fees and 'haram levies' from various legal and illicit businesses, a type of morality racketeering that profited from the presence of 'vice' by claiming to eliminate it. The choice of targets for FPI raids (*razia*) are carefully calculated, with clubs, bars or brothels owned or protected by the military, mass organisations or other powerful figures overlooked.[55] Its relationship with the police at the local level has frequently fluctuated between cooperation and conflict, with anti-vice activities threatening police payoffs from brothels or gambling dens. Generally, however, they have sought to establish mutual accommodation of some kind. It has become standard practice, for example, for the FPI to report the intention to carry out a raid to the police, who are then provided with the opportunity to approach the intended target and negotiate 'protection'. In other instances the police are present at FPI raids on the pretext of making sure things 'don't get

out of hand', or even as active partners.[56] By targeting those without adequate protection, it aided in consolidating the monopoly of some kingpins of Jakarta's nightlife, forcing smaller businesses to be bought out or seek their protection.[57] The organisation stridently denies this as an intentional strategy, but not its occurrence. According to the FPI's former chairman and 'grand imam', Habib Rizieq, the prevalence of cases of extortion and racketeering by FPI members was an outcome of its efforts to 'embrace' and reform petty criminals and preman, who would at times stray from the path, together with the infiltration of those seeking to 'destroy the organisation from within'.[58]

For local preman the FPI provided a new cover for racketeering, with migrations from Pemuda Pancasila and other ormas which perceived 'Islam' as being the latest and most efficacious organisational cover for racketeering and extortion (Wilson 2008). The attraction to the urban poor and working class of the FPI, who constitute the overwhelming majority of its members, has been driven by a mix of pragmatic instrumentalism, including livelihood generation, normative notions of religious piety, and anxieties and resentments over the territorial, economic and moral integrity of their neighbourhoods in the face of Jakarta's ongoing process of social and economic transformation. Its meshing of 'militant chic' radical rhetoric and an emphasis upon 'direct action' has become a major draw for kampung youth who otherwise might have little interest in its broader religiously framed objectives (Wilson 2014). However, this was only one dimension of its appeal. Class tensions and socioeconomic resentment, particularly as localised within contexts of Jakarta's spatial politics, were frequently a thinly veiled subtext in accounts by urban poor FPI members of the sources and causes of vice, and hence the localised subjects of the group's hostility. Often with little concern for religious piety, members frequently cited the complicity of the police in protecting organised crime as a reason why they turned to the FPI, as well as frustration at the ease with which developers were able to buy their way out of compliance with regulations limiting the proximity to residential areas of bars, clubs and 24-hour mini-market franchises selling alcohol.

For example, the FPI and an assortment of Islamist groups seized upon competition between established neighbourhoods and more recent migrants in the peri-urban and suburbanised areas of greater Jakarta, in particular Bekasi, where processes of urbanisation, population growth, land conversion and in-city migration have been highest.[59] Initial flashpoints in Bekasi were alleged attempts at 'Christianisation' of Bekasi Muslims instigated by evangelical Pentecostal groups. Popular amongst uprooted migrant workers in Bekasi's industrial estates who are 'attracted to groups that offer ready-made communities', while for the most part self-contained, a small number of radical neo-Pentecostal groups launched aggressive campaigns in Bekasi aimed at gaining conversions from the Muslim poor (International Crisis Group 2010, 2). A plethora of 'radical' Islamic groups seeking to protect the Ummah from Christian onslaught descended upon Bekasi, and many locals were 'radicalised' to the cause and recruited into their ranks, with the FPI at

the forefront. In effect, the radical Pentecostals and Islamists, including the FPI, were competing for capturing the same constituency, the urban poor and working class of Bekasi. It was against this backdrop of increased hostilities, fears of creeping 'Christianisation' and the stratifying of citizenship between locals and 'others', that ethnic Batak became a specific target of Islamic vigilante attention, many of whom were members of the Batak Protestant Parish (*Huria Kristen Batak Protestan*, or HKBP).[60] As an ethnic church, the HKBP does not engage in missionary activity, so the ostensive concern about attempts to convert local Muslims had no substantive foundation. Yet the Christianisation discourse became a convenient one for rationalising simmering resentment over the changing face of Bekasi as a steady stream of economic migrants, of which the Batak were one of the largest segments, intensified tensions over limited space, jobs and economic resources. The expanding manufacturing sector offered opportunities, but also resentment when these opportunities were not realised.[61] Focusing upon the controversial 2006 government Joint Regulation 8/9 regulating the conditions under which places of worship can be built, the FPI and others manipulated these tensions discursively to reframe endeavours on the part of HKBP to build new places of worship catering for their growing congregation as an attack on the integrity of the Islamic community.[62] It proved an easy sell to those who felt threatened or marginalised, including local kyai for whom it provided an opportunity to re-establish what some considered their waning authority as local leaders.[63] The FPI were successful not just in preventing church construction, but more broadly in generating new forms of 'legitimate' domination of minorities that were grounded in a mix of existing state legislation and parochialism.

Similarly in other parts of Bekasi, extensive processes of land transformation, the displacement of poor communities and the reinforcement of socio-economic segregation by the expansion of gated communities for the upper-middle class together with industrial estates, were transformed into battles for the integrity of the Muslim faithful. In 2007, for example, the PT Dutabumi Adipratama property group commissioned a statue by the renowned sculptor Nyoman Nuartato to be placed at the entrance of the Kota Harapan Indah ('City of Beautiful Hopes') housing complex. One of a raft of gated housing estates concentrated in West and North Bekasi aimed at the upper-middle-class property market, it is the largest in the district, covering over 2,000 hectares. The 17 metre-high statue, titled 'three beauties' (*tiga mojang*), was of three woman in traditional Sundanese dress. It was not until 2010 that the statue came to the attention of the FPI in the wake of the Christianisation furore and with sensitivities high over territorial identity. Objections to the statue ranged from it being obscene, culturally inappropriate, covert Christianisation and, as a representation of the human form, an offence to Islam.[64] Similarly in Pekayon, South Bekasi, a replica of the Statue of Liberty erected at the front of Grand Galaxy City luxury estate attracted the ire of residents, with the FPI rallying to demand that this symbol of 'American cultural

imperialism' be removed.[65] In each case the statues became rallying points for opposition to the changing socioeconomic face of Bekasi, a reaction to spatial and social marginalisation from exclusivist spaces for the rich, spaces from which locals were economically, socially and culturally excluded, a symbolic contestation of boundaries demarcating 'community' and differing social orders.[66]

The FPI's leadership has sought to exploit these tensions strategically using conflict and mobilisation of sentiment and people as a means to exert influence over local government, to introduce and enforce regulations it is well positioned to police. Appealing to conservative Islamists and their sympathisers entails fairly minimal political concessions, such as adopting a hard-line stance against soft political targets like religious minorities, with the potential to electorally mobilise groups ideologically disinclined to vote in the context of high levels of non-participation and informal voting.[67] Hence the ability of the FPI to broker electoral deals, such as that with governor of West Java Ahmad Heryawan, who signed a pledge with the FPI during his campaign for re-election in 2012 that if returned to office he would outlaw Ahmadiyah and safeguard 'an Islamic atmosphere' in the province.[68] The more general rise of conservative, religiously framed morality as a form of political capital in Indonesia has seen an increasing convergence of the agendas of Islamic vigilantes such as the FPI and regional and national political leaders. In East Java the mayor of Surabaya, Tri Rismaharini, captured the much-needed political support of religious conservatives and radicals, including the FPI, through her forced closure of Dolly, one of Southeast Asia's largest centres of prostitution.[69] Anti-vice movements have increasingly intersected with broader 'anti-liberal' forces that have found support amongst the city's middle class, not infrequently manifesting in sentimentality for the Suharto era and those who champion its return. An early critic of the FPI's involvement in sectarian violence, for example, Fahira Idris, later became a vocal supporter of its raids on alcohol sellers, arguing that the FPI 'lightened the burden of the police'.[70] The FPI subsequently mobilised support for her election bid for the Jakarta DPD, which she won with the highest number of votes of any candidate on the back of a campaign promising to 'clean up the city' and a broadly 'anti-liberal' agenda.[71]

In 2010 the FPI briefly played with the idea of forming its own political party and forwarding Rizieq as a presidential candidate, in spite of his regular exhortations that 'democracy was more *haram* than pigs' meat'.[72] Despite its rejection of democracy as being antithetical to Islam, the FPI has nonetheless been adept in playing a particular kind of politics shaped by the broader framework of the electoral system. Its early position of boycotting democracy was replaced in the lead up to the 2014 elections by the strategy of 'seize power first, argue later' (*rebut kekuasaan, baru rebut!*).[73] This allowed it to maintain its 'radical' position rejecting democracy while engaging in electoral politicking, encouraging Muslims to participate in electoral democracy as a means of ending it. The 2014 legislative and presidential elections were,

according to the FPI, a 'period of dire emergency' for Muslims and it was imperative that those who would 'defend Islam' from liberals, secularists and communists be supported.[74] On the back of this stance it developed an increasingly long list of very public supporters from amongst the nation's political elite. For example, Yudhoyono administration Minister for Religion and Chairman of the PPP Suryadharma Ali offered a legislative nomination to the FPI's spokesman Munarman.[75] When questioned over the appropriateness of collaborating with a violent vigilante group, his response was that it was preferable to 'co-opt' the FPI rather than 'make an enemy out of them'.[76] Other national politicians followed suit. In 2013 Home Affairs Minister Gamawan Fauzi, who less than a year earlier had threatened to disband the group forcibly due to its 'anarchic violence', called the FPI a 'national asset', adding that regional leaders should work with them 'in order that they play a constructive role in development'.[77] Prabowo Subianto also extended a hand, stating that they could be constructively 'embraced', later accepting the FPI's endorsement of his 2014 presidential bid.[78]

Despite the FPI's Islamist rhetoric and flirtations with seasoned radicals such as Abu Bakar Basyir, it is in many respects an ideological bedfellow with hard-line nationalists and those on the political right who advocate a return to the original authoritarian 1945 Constitution and whose voices have grown considerably louder since 2012. It has differentiated itself from other Islamists, such as Hizbut Tahrir, by not rejecting the Pancasila as a national ideology but instead arguing that the so-called 'problem of democracy' in Indonesia is a problem of history, requiring a return to what Habib Rizieq argues are the Islamic foundations of the Indonesian republic and constitution.[79] These, he claims, have been misinterpreted and subverted by the infiltration of Western notions of majority-rule democracy and values of liberalism and secularism (Rizieq 2012). According to Rizieq, there was never any constitutional declaration that Indonesia was a 'democratic state'; rather, the fourth principle of the state ideology of Pancasila establishes the republic as a nation based upon *musyawarah* and *mufakat*, or consensus decision making through deliberation, which he claims is an authentic Islamic tradition and the mode of governance practised by the Prophet Muhammad (Rizieq 2012). The FPI's stance then is right-wing nationalist rather than pan-Islamic, insofar as it reiterates the importance of the territorial integrity of the republic, and the centrality of the original constitution and the Pancasila.[80] This stance easily facilitates collaboration with secular nationalists opposed to liberal democracy. A key campaign platform of 2014 presidential contender Prabowo Subianto and his political vehicle Gerindra, for example, was a return to the original 1945 Constitution as a means to '"correct" liberal democratic aspects of the political system which do not fit the character of the Indonesian nation and have caused national legal and political instability counter-productive to Indonesia's "development"' (Butt 2014). A week before the presidential election Prabowo accepted the title of 'war commander of Muslims' at a gathering of hard-line groups in Yogyakarta, including Laskar Jihad and the FPI,

which proclaimed him as their only hope of preventing Indonesia from becoming a secular state.[81]

What was it that attracted national politicians to the FPI, an organisation that is arguably deeply unpopular amongst the public? The coercive 'attack dog' capacity of the FPI is one consideration, and like other ormas, the ability to mobilise masses. However, in comparison to larger organisations in the city such as the FBR, Forkabi or Pemuda Pancasila, the FPI has far less of a sustained territorial presence, rather mobilising around issues than attempting to consolidate locally, which could in turn place pressure on the organisation to reorient its goals and resources more directly to the material welfare of its members, undermining its image as selfless defenders of the faith. What has given the FPI its power, gauged in terms of its longevity, ability to influence policy and gain support of political elites is not strength of numbers, but its ability to hijack and subsequently shape social and economic tensions and the public discourse surrounding these in ways that facilitate 'resolution' via the introduction of its preferred forms of 'moral order' – forms of order largely conducive to those of local and national political elites. Responding to claims of a threat to the religious majority, via Syariah-inspired regulations, for example, is also a convenient diversionary issue for politicians embroiled in almost constant allegations of corruption and graft. This is reflected in its ideological preferences, which easily facilitate incorporation into elite political structures and networks, the FPI aligning itself with a broader coalition of authoritarian, ultra-nationalist and anti-democratic forces. It has engaged in what al-Zastrouw (2006, 20) has referred to as 'symbolic militancy', co-opting the dissent of the urban poor together with instrumental self-interest through the projecting salient of 'majority' religious identities, capturing class resentments and tensions within a broadly conservative political frame.

Counter-insurgent campaigning: Prabowo, Hercules and the 2014 presidential election

After his discharge from the military in 1998 due to his role in the kidnapping and torture of anti-Suharto activists, Prabowo Subianto spent several years of self-imposed exile in Jordan, before returning to Indonesia in 2001. Having amassed wealth from an oil business in Central Asia, he soon went about re-establishing himself amongst Jakarta's elites in the pursuit of his new political ambition, to become president (Mietzner 2013, 88). After failing to win the presidential nomination of Golkar in 2008, and with the financial backing of his billionaire brother Hashim Djojohadikusumo, he established his own political vehicle, the political party Great Indonesia Movement (*Gerakan Raya Indonesia* or Gerindra). He ran unsuccessfully as Megawati's deputy in 2009, losing in a landslide victory to the incumbent, and Gerindra fared poorly in the legislative election in the same year, with only 4.5% of the vote. Deflated in the wake of these defeats, it was not until 2011 that Prabowo revived his political machine, focusing his eyes on the 2014 presidential election. As this

would be his last shot at the top job, losing was, in his words, 'not an option'.[82] One component of his 'all-out' approach was the reactivation of the networks of gangs, militias and martial arts groups that he had fostered throughout his military career. Prabowo had been the exponent par excellence of strategies of counter-insurgency and unconventional warfare. According to Wandelt (2007), one of Prabowo's major contributions was to expand the parameters of the use of civilian auxiliaries and militias. He also outlined a thesis for the integration of East Timor into Indonesia, arguing that strategic groups needed to be offered exclusive material benefits to fight on behalf of the Indonesian state, benefits that would be lost if they switched loyalties (Wandelt 2007, 133). Beginning in the early 1990s, he operationalised this approach, establishing militias such as Gada Paksi in East Timor and working relationships with 'strategic' groups, in particular gangs and marginalised youth, providing vocational training such as via the Tiara programme. Outside conflict areas he also worked to build and train networks of loyalist forces in urban centres throughout the country. During the late 1980s, for example, he established the pencak silat school, Young Indonesian Warriors (*Satria Muda Indonesia*, or SMI).[83] A long-time practitioner of various martial arts, Prabowo saw in pencak silat the perfect vehicle for 'instilling military values and discipline in the civilian population', and as a key component of state defence (Subianto 1995). With a motto of 'defend the self to defend the nation' (*bela diri untuk bela bangsa*), the SMI became another component of Prabowo's arsenal of militarised civilians engaged in cross-training with Kopassus special forces and instructed in crowd-control techniques. In the wake of riots surrounding Suharto's fall in May 1998, the SMI was implicated in targeted violence against ethnic Chinese, together with an array of thugs, militias, and whom Prabowo had shipped into the capital two months prior (Friend 2003, 345). As an outcome of his political mobilisation of the SMI, Prabowo was expelled from the central board of the IPSI, only to return and seize the national chairmanship at IPSI's first direct election in 2004, and again in 2012.[84] Stacking the central leadership with SMI loyalists, he sought to foster IPSI as a platform for mobilising support for Gerindra and his presidential bid. For Prabowo, 'unconventional warfare' and politics were inextricably intertwined, and he now brought the same strategies and logics to the arena of Indonesia's electoral democracy. In this, Hercules would be expected to play a central role.

After his expulsion from Tanah Abang, Hercules had worked hard to rebuild his career, establishing what became a lucrative debt-collection, security and land-brokering service that catered to the city's businesses and political elites. Through this he was able to buy into the fishing industry, purchase swaths of rice-farming land and a Catholic management college close to Tanah Abang, also becoming something of a philanthropist with regular donations to several orphanages.[85] While running legitimate businesses, he continued to keep a foot in the world of gang politics, in particular ongoing feuds with rival Eastern Indonesian gangs. Obsessed with

representing himself as having moved on from his gangster past, in 2005 he spent two months in prison after his gang ransacked the offices of the newspaper *Indopos* in response to an article in which Hercules was described as a 'preman' – the irony of which apparently escaped him.[86]

He also re-established links to his homeland of East Timor, now an independent nation. In 2009 Hercules returned as part of an Indonesian business delegation, publicly greeted and embraced by Prime Minister Xanana Gusmao and President Jose Ramos Horta.[87] Hercules was allegedly operating as a broker for the interests of business tycoon and Indonesia military financier Tomy Winata, who secured a controversial multi-million-dollar property development deal, while Hercules obtained one to build a supermarket on the Dili waterfront.[88] This was despite Hercules being implicated in assisting Alfredo Reinado, the rebel East Timorese army commander who had been killed in an attempted assassination of Ramos Horta a year earlier.[89]

It is difficult to ascertain what specifically led to this rekindling of Hercules's and Prabowo's relationship, other than the renewed political utility of it for both, and perhaps also Hercules's self-proclaimed 'close emotional bond' to the man who despite betraying him, had saved his life.[90] He had flirted with other elite patrons, in 2009 joining Yudhoyono's presidential re-election team in his campaign that was contested unsuccessfully by Megawati and Prabowo. Hercules's support on the ground may have been strategically useful for Yudhoyono but it did not necessarily make for good publicity, with Hercules later claiming the Democrat Party had 'used and exploited me, then cast me aside'.[91] With Prabowo's 2014 presidential ambitions clear and their relationship repaired, in July 2012 Hercules announced the establishment of a new organisation, *Gerakan Rakyat Indonesian Baru* (People's Movement for a New Indonesia, or GRIB).[92] Registered as an ostensibly independent societal organisation, GRIB was unambiguously political in its objectives: to bring Prabowo to the presidency.[93] It was to all effects and purposes an operational wing of Gerindra, its 'independent' status in order to create distance in the case of any scandal. Organisationally it drew upon a diverse array of preman and strongman networks, ex-military and militias, martial arts groups and local bosses linked to Hercules and Prabowo. With strict orders to avoid any overt criminal activity, for the most part adhered to, GRIB became a highly disciplined organisational umbrella for Prabowo's extensive networks of violent entrepreneurs, with Hercules in command. Prabowo brought the military logic of 'unconventional warfare' to the task of winning the presidency.

Piggybacking on the national party structure of Gerindra, GRIB quickly established branches in 30 provinces and 265 districts, with a membership claimed to be in the hundreds of thousands, though realistically closer to around 50,000.[94] GRIB was assigned two key roles by Prabowo. The first was as a grass-roots component of his PR machine, distributing cash and goods to the poor, such as providing aid to disaster victims, or more overt campaigning such as handing out free food to ojek or pedicab drivers.[95] Gerindra

strategists had early on identified the importance of capturing the vote of the urban poor if Prabowo was to have any chance of victory.[96] This increased as a political imperative when Jakarta's Governor Joko Widodo announced his intention to run. With a well-publicised image as a humble and self-effacing champion of the poor, Gerindra sought to counter Widodo's reputation through the distribution of cash, using GRIB as its foot soldiers.

The second task of GRIB was to co-opt what Gerindra officials referred to as 'local opinion leaders', such as strongmen, village heads, district officials and religious leaders.[97] The reasoning behind such a strategy was twofold: to use their influence and authority to mobilise electoral support in the lead-up to the election; and to have in place a grass-roots network ready to 'secure' the result.[98] GRIB did this through establishing patronage relationships and dispensing favours, such as contracts linked to Gerindra campaign events, which it claimed would bear further fruit if Prabowo became president.[99] It operated as on the ground propagandists in so-called 'black campaigning' which had a serious impact on Widodo's early unassailable lead in the polls.[100] GRIB networks spread rumours and allegations about Widodo and his political party, the PDI-P, such as that it was a bastion of Christians, communists and former political prisoners, and that Widodo was a closet Christian whose inner circle consisted of ethnic Batak.[101] These proved pivotal in winning over local kyai and ulama, particularly in conservative Muslim areas such as West Java. In interviews with senior GRIB members, it was clear that few believed the rumours to have much basis in fact, but all agreed it was 'effective'.[102]

GRIB has also offered its services as a means of brokering support for Prabowo. In December 2012, for example, GRIB acted as security for a demonstration of over 12,000 civil servants from the Indonesian Association of Village Officials, in front of the national parliament, establishing links that would prove crucial in consolidating Prabowo's campaigning in rural areas.[103] Hercules also joined forces with Prince Tedjowulan of the Sasana Purnama Royal House of Surakarta, assisting as 'backup' in the long-running feud between Tedjowulan and his twin brother Hangabehi over who was the legitimate heir.[104] For this he was bestowed with the Javanese royal title of Kanjeng Raden Haryo Yudhopranoto, ostensibly for his 'appreciation of Javanese culture' and service to the nation.[105] A former army colonel who knew Hercules from his time in East Timor in the late 1970s, Tedjowulan became an active supporter of Prabowo's presidential bid, providing a potential counter to the immense popularity in Surakarta of Widodo, who had served two terms as the city's mayor.[106] Hercules's own public profile, akin to that of a minor celebrity with regular appearances on TV talk shows and in the tabloid press, together with a reputation for being a loyal and generous patron, also acted as a draw.[107]

By early 2012 his main competitor in Jakarta's debt-collection economy and his bitterest rival, John Kei, had been removed from the scene, after being sentenced to 12 years' jail for the murder of Sanex Steel boss Harry Tantono.

His brother and replacement as head of the Kei empire, Tito Kei, was shot dead in 2013 in what was rumoured to be a military-linked hit.[108] It cleared the way for Hercules to claim his place as Jakarta's kingpin, with the ascendency of Prabowo to the presidency set to secure his place. However, things did not go as planned. The rapid growth of GRIB in Jakarta had unsettled segments of the police and the city's national elites. The possibility of a Prabowo presidency posed a threat to the police's post-1998 political and financial ascendency over the military. The violent feuds between Hercules and the Kei and Sangaji clans had also created considerable disruption, and they were viewed as unstable and volatile elements of the city's organised underworld.[109] Unlike the FBR, Forkabi or the FPI, with which the police had established a degree of mutual accommodation, the relationship with Hercules remained deeply antagonistic. With significant financial resources derived from Gerindra's campaign coffers, GRIB was able to outbid and outmanoeuvre its political rivals for the 'loyalty' of preman and ormas, which threatened to disrupt the balance of powers in the political economy of rackets. Key figures from the FPI such as Ahmad Mubarok, and also from BPPKB and Madurese gangs, had already joined its ranks, posing the possibility of a new and powerful coalition serving the interests of Prabowo.[110]

The West Jakarta police established a special 'preman hunting team' with Hercules and his gang as its main target.[111] On 8 March 2013 the police hosted an 'anti-preman' close to Hercules's home. Protesting that it was a deliberate provocation, after a short scuffle he and 45 members of his gang were arrested on charges of resisting arrest, extortion and illegal firearms possession. Within GRIB and Gerindra it was strongly believed that Hercules's arrest was the product of direct political intervention by President Yudhoyono, who despite later joining Prabowo's coalition, was also apparently unnerved by the growing street-level presence of his former campaign team member, reflective as it was of Prabowo's aggressive counter-insurgency-style approach to political campaigning.[112] Publicly Gerindra admonished the trial as a political beat-up, while also emphasising that GRIB and Hercules had no formal affiliation with the party.[113] Apart from a brief statement from Prabowo that if Hercules had done something wrong, 'he must be like a knight who faces all the consequences', he subsequently made no further public comment on the case, sensitive that his affiliation to Hercules could be used in 'black campaigning' against him.[114] Hercules was once again, it seemed, on his own. The police engaged in their own black campaign against Hercules, leaking to the media that his gang was linked to an exceptionally violent sexual assault of a woman street vendor.[115] In reality, those responsible were unknown to Hercules, though in the sweep to find the culprits the police took the opportunity to arrest 18 more of his gang and did little to downplay the perception of his gang's involvement.[116]

GRIB's Secretary-General Rahman claimed that Gerindra intelligence sources had confirmed the police were planning to set up Hercules for arrest, and that Prabowo had requested that Hercules and his family move to his

expansive ranch home in Hambalang, West Jakarta.[117] Hercules declined. On his arrest in March 2013 he was said to have been given an ultimatum by the police: either leave GRIB and its political mission of supporting Prabowo's presidential bid and return to his various businesses, or face imprisonment.[118] Loyal to his patron, Hercules refused the offer and was subsequently charged. To the police's anger, he was only sentenced to four months for the lesser charge of resisting arrest. However, the police had been preparing further charges, and within minutes of leaving prison at the end of his sentence, Hercules was immediately rearrested and charged with extortion and money laundering in relation to a case extending from 2006 to 2013.[119] It was alleged that Hercules had extorted protection fees from a property developer and then laundered the funds by depositing it in a bank account held by his wife.[120] After a three-month trial, on 8 May 2014 he was found guilty on both charges and sentenced to three years' imprisonment, removing him from the streets for the remainder of the campaign period, and beyond. An initial lodging of an appeal against the sentence by Hercules's lawyers was later withdrawn, reportedly on the orders of the Gerindra hierarchy who instructed him to 'wait and see' what transpired after the 9 July election. Hercules's businesses also came under attack, with an unexpected reversal of a decision regarding the contested land title of the Saint Mary managerial college he ran in Tanah Abang in favour of a rival claimant, with the court-ordered seizure of the property executed by the police.[121]

Incarceration did not prevent Hercules from continuing to run his organisation and business interests from inside prison, with daily reports and weekly meetings with GRIB officials. He made good use of his time to develop further his own and GRIB's networks, regularly providing extra meals and free clothes for inmates.[122] Three of his senior gang members granted sentence remissions refused the opportunity to be released early in order to stay inside and safeguard and assist their boss. He soon established himself as a patron and benefactor within the prison, fostering a new cohort of loyal followers who also were committed to supporting their new boss's boss, Prabowo.[123] Partly through Hercules's agency, Prabowo and his running mate Hatta Rahjasa had the dubious honour of winning a majority of votes in Cipinang prison.[124] In the days following the election, and with what appeared as the dawning reality of a Prabowo loss, Hercules announced from prison that both parties should respect the results whatever they might be, perhaps already seeing his future as lying elsewhere.[125]

The rise of Prabowo's networks, in particular those linked to Hercules, led to intensive debate within other ormas in Jakarta over what implications this, and his presidency, could have for their own territorial regimes. The FBR, for example, which had risen in the wake of Hercules's expulsion from Tanah Abang, argued internally as to whether this should impact upon their voting preference.[126] Yet in the build-up to the elections it and almost all of the large ormas in the city declared their unequivocal support for Prabowo's presidential bid, including the FPI, FBR, Pemuda Panca Marga, BKKPB,

Pemuda Pancasila and Forkabi.[127] In some neighbourhoods the FBR arguably played a pivotal role in directing residents to vote for Prabowo. As kampung residents interviewed by Roanne van Voorst stated, 'FBR helps us when there are floods or when evictions loom. We must support FBR in return', in this case by voting for their preferred candidate (Voorst 2014). Territorial rivalries and ostensive ideological differences aside, it seemed that the leaderships of these ormas shared a desire for a 'decisive' and authoritarian strongman leading the country who could, it was believed, pay for their loyalty, perhaps seeing in him the embodiment of the logics of territorial, coercive and patronage-based politics that they reproduced. That Prabowo campaigned on a platform of rolling back democratic reforms and reinstating presidential authoritarianism suggests that democracy was for them, as it was for Prabowo, a means to undemocratic ends (Aspinall and Mietzner 2014).

Conclusions

Political violence has faded as an effective strategy in contesting elections in the capital. Simply put, it does not deliver votes. Yet while more crude forms of violent political gangsterism may have declined, the role of ormas and militias in electoral politics has far from diminished. Rather, it has intertwined in increasingly complex ways with the kinds of transactional politics that have come to characterise Indonesia's democracy. These gangster populists are in many respects its most skilled practitioners. For political parties and aspirants for seats in regional and national legislatures, the value of alliances with these organisations and networks lies in several key areas: their ability to mobilise masses at critical junctures such as during campaign periods; the access provided to the 'grass-roots' public; and the ability to shape populist discourse as representatives, claimed or actual, of particular constituencies. They have been mediators between social groups, and between society and the world of formal politics. Recognising the vulnerabilities of political fates determined by elections, the FBR have adopted a pragmatic and assertive approach, using their self-proclaimed status as a voice for the Betawi poor and working class and as a 'stabilising' force in the city to broker deals, concessions and funds from political parties and the city administration. In the case of the FPI, despite their ostensive oppositional stance towards the state, and democracy itself, they have adopted ideological preferences that have easily facilitated alliances with political elites. Insofar as they have been able to capture the resentment and class tensions emerging from processes of deeply uneven neo-liberal capitalist development, they have remained perennially useful as literal 'attack dogs', but also as ideological ones. The FPI has used its claim of defending the integrity of moral and religious order to mobilise public opinion and sentiment in ways conducive to the introduction of authoritarian responses.

Notes

1 *Panji Masyarakat* (2000) 'Gila tentara di tubuh sipil', 24 May.
2 According to King (2003), the violent reputation of the PKB's paramilitaries resulted in it being referred to as the *Partai Kehancuran Nasional*, or 'National Destruction Party'.
3 In 2003 the PP established its own political vehicle, the Patriot Party (*Partai Patriot*) with the PP leader Yapto Suryosoermarno as its chairman. However, despite claiming a membership in the millions, it had little in the way of electoral success. In 2004 it won only 1.04%, followed by 0.53% in 2009, falling well below the 2.5% electoral threshold for a seat in the People's Representative Council (*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat*, or DPR).
4 Interview with gang leader, Jakarta, 2007.
5 On the use of satgas in Central Java and Yogyakarta, see King 2003, and Lee 2004.
6 In December 2000 over 30 bombs were delivered to churches in 11 cities across six provinces. Wired to explode simultaneously on Christmas Eve, the highly coordinated attack, carried out by the terrorist networks of Jemaah Islamiyah, resulted in 19 deaths and over 120 injured. For a detailed account of anti-Chinese violence in 1998, see Purdey 2006.
7 *Gatra* (2003) 'Kasad: ganti seragam loreng satgas parpol!' 13 November.
8 *Suara Pembaruan* (2002) 'PDI-P tolak pembubaran satgasnya', 9 November.
9 The exceptions to this would be the satgas of the PAN and PKS, both of which adopted a far less militaristic style and approach.
10 The most well-known example of which was Brigass, a paramilitary group-turned security company led by former Megawati loyalist Pius Lustrilanang. He later went on to join the Gerindra party of Prabowo Subianto, winning a seat in the national parliament representing the eastern Indonesian province of Nusa Tenggara Timur.
11 Interview with PDI-P official, Jakarta, 2009.
12 Interview with Lutfi Hakim, Jakarta, 2009.
13 Interview, Jakarta, 2010.
14 In Pedongkelan the RT used the FBR gardu as the 'base camp' for organising community resistance to eviction. Interview, Jakarta, 2013. *Liputan6.com* (2013) 'Ratusan anggotta FBR jaga Waduk Ria Rio', 4 September.
15 I was unable to get exact figures on how many FBR RT and RW there are in Jakarta. The leadership claimed it was in the hundreds. There are six mayors in Jakarta, one for each of its administrative districts.
16 *Tribun Jakarta* (2014) 'Ahok: banyak preman di Jakarta jadi ketua RT/RW', 13 June. Yudhoyono's Democrat Party, as well as Gerindra, of which Ahok is a member, have both proposed removing direct elections for regional heads. *Beritasatu.com* (2013) 'Penghapusan Pilkada langsung menguat', 3 December.
17 Only the top four ranking candidates win a DPD seat.
18 This equated to 231,087 votes.
19 Interview with Lutfi Hakim, Jakarta, 2014.
20 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2006. Jakarta is the only city in the country where mayors are not directly elected, but instead appointed from the ranks of the civil service by the governor based upon considerations from regional parliament. The end of a mayor's term in office is also determined by the governor.
21 According to Hakim, 'national parties only show lip service to local issues during the campaign period. Essentially for them it's a numbers game. Local parties would by their very nature be more responsive to local issues and can be

held directly accountable when they fail to deliver on promises'. Interview with Lutfi Hakim, Jakarta, 2009.

22 It has over the course of its existence publicly supported the PDI-P, PKS, PPP, PAN, Golkar, Partai Demokrat and Hanura.

23 *Vivanews* (2009) 'Kampanye PAN di Blok S: Didukung FBR, PAN pasti menang di Jakarta', 3 March.

24 These were largely related to security and cleaning contracts at party events, and 'in principle' agreements to 'work constructively' with the party if their candidate won. Interview with FBR commander, Jakarta, 2010.

25 Interview with Lutfi Hakim, Jakarta, 2013.

26 Interview with FBR field commander, Jakarta, 2010. Andi Anzhar won by a narrow margin. In 2013 he was the subject of an investigation by the Indonesian Corruption Eradication Commission (*Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi* or KPK) over allegations of deception in the buying and selling of company shares, losing his bid for re-election in 2014. On several occasions Azhar defended the FBR in parliament against claims it was a disruptive preman group. *Tempo* (2010) 'PAN tak setuju FBR dinilai buruk', 30 August.

27 *Seruu.com* (2014) 'Incar posisi 3 DKI, Caleg PAN kukuhkan relawan pemenangan', 9 September.

28 During the 2014 presidential election, for example, I saw the same groups of youths at election rallies of both candidates. Each claimed to have been paid Rp.100,000 to attend, plus a t-shirt, a meal and cigarettes.

29 For example, in several districts the FBR intimidated gas bottle sellers from companies in competition with those owned by Andi Azhar. Gas stoves are commonly used for cooking, with the sale of gas bottles a highly lucrative and competitive industry.

30 The usual method is to photograph the appropriately filled in ballot paper with a mobile phone, with payment received once this has been confirmed. This has led to the introduction of regulations prohibiting voters from taking phones into voting booths. *Global Post* (2009) 'A bag of sugar for your votes?' 4 July.

31 See for example, *Merdeka* (2014) 'Jagoannya kalah, timses caleg di Banten minta uang kembali', 12 April.

32 Interview with an FBR member, Jakarta, 2010.

33 Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Jakarta, 2006.

34 Governors have a limit of two five-year terms.

35 Interview with Bamus official, Jakarta, 2010.

36 Interview with FBR field commander, Jakarta 2007.

37 Interview with Laskar Jayakarta member, Jakarta, 2012. *Jakarta Post* (2009) 'New underworld: brain over brawn', 28 August.

38 *Antara News* (2007) 'KPU tetapkan Fauzi Bowo-Prianto pemenang Pilkada DKI 2007', 16 August.

39 KNPI is an umbrella organisation for youth groups, including those such as Pemuda Pancasila, established during the New Order.

40 See *Jurnas.com* (2012) 'Kisah duit hibah Jakarta', 10 July.

41 *Metro News Malam* (2008) TV news programme, Metro TV, Jakarta, 20 August.

42 *Jakarta Post* (2012) 'FBR withholds endorsements in Jakarta governor race', 21 March.

43 Interview with FBR regional commander, Jakarta, 2012.

44 Widodo's deputy, Basuki 'Ahok' Purnama, is a Gerindra party member.

45 Interview with FBR field commander, Jakarta, 2013. *Merdeka.com* (2013) 'Antara Prabowo, Jokowi dan Hercules', 9 March.

46 Interview with Jakarta administration official, Jakarta, 2012. The FBR had proposed providing security and cleaning staff for planned extensions to the city's public bus network.

47 Widodo stated that he chose Si Pitung's house as he was a 'champion for the poor and the oppressed'. *Kompas* (2014) 'Deklarasi di rumah Si Pitung, Jokowi harus minta maaf', 22 March.
48 Interview with Lutfi Hakim, Jakarta, 2012.
49 *Tempo* (1998) 'Berjihad Mendukung Sidang', 30 November. Habib are Islamic scholars, usually of Hadhrami-Arab descent who claim genealogical links to the family of the Prophet Muhammad. The FPI's chairman Habib Rizieq Shihab is the son of Sayyid Husein, a founder of the Panda Arab movement, a kind of Boy Scout's movement for Arab Indonesians. In the early 1990s Rizieq studied Islamic law at the University of Imam Muhammad ibn Saud in Saudia Arabia, before returning to Indonesia where he became an outspoken *mubaligh* preacher and also school principal at a Hadhrami-run madrassa. As a habib, in particular one who had studied in Saudi Arabia, Rizieq commanded a certain reverential authority amongst traditional Betawi society in particular.
50 The gambling den was run by Christian Ambonese gangsters. The attack, intentionally or not, ultimately favoured a rival casino operated by tycoon and Suharto-family associate Tommy Winata. The subsequent return of several dozen Ambonese gangsters to their home has been identified as a triggering factor in the outbreak of prolonged sectarian violence in Ambon (Sidel 2006, 177). For a more detailed account of the background to Ketapang, see Aditjondro 2001.
51 *Gatra* (2012) 'FPI vs Ahmadiyah: kapan berakhir?' 28 October.
52 *Kompas* (1999) '13 Jam Diduduki FPI Kantor Gubernur DKI Lumpuh', 14 December.
53 *Jakarta Post* (2011) 'Wikileaks: National police funded FPI hard-liners', 5 September.
54 Interview with Noegroho Djadoesman, Jakarta, 2006.
55 Interview with FPI member, Jakarta, 2007. The FPI has a dedicated intelligence wing that gathers background information and responds to complaints from local residents. Typically raids involve several dozen FPI members armed with sticks and clubs, smashing windows, breaking tables and chairs, and not infrequently beating customers and staff.
56 *Merdeka* (2013) 'FPI sebut razia miras di Bandung cuma bantu polisi', 26 July.
57 Interview with Jakarta bar owner, Jakarta, 2011.
58 Interview with Habib Rizieq, Jakarta, 2012. According to Rizieq this included those from state intelligence agencies together with unnamed forces 'intent on undermining Islam'.
59 The Indonesian Setara Institute identified Bekasi, together with Depok and Tangerang, as the areas of significant increases in violence and intimidation against religious minorities since 2008, much of it linked to a variety of Islamic vigilante and militia groups. See Hasani and Naipospos 2011.
60 Interview with Murhali Barda, head of FPI Bekasi, Bekasi, 2011.
61 Due to a number of factors, including formal education levels, migrants such as Batak were often better placed to gain manufacturing jobs than ethnic Betawi.
62 The 2006 regulation requires support from at least 60 community members of different religions together with recommendations from a special religious harmony forum established for the sole purpose of governing the regulation as a condition for approval for a new place of worship. It has proven easily manipulable by Islamist groups as a means to mobilise local sentiment against minority religious groups. For more on the regulation and background to the Bekasi case, see International Crisis Group 2010.
63 Confidential interview with Bekasi kyai, 2011.
64 Interview with Murhali Barda, Bekasi, 2011. The complex had already been the subject of complaints by local residents on the grounds that its construction had contributed to increased flooding.

65 *Berita8.com* (2011) 'Patung Liberty di Bekasi bertahan delapan jam', 29 November.
66 Local FPI informants stated that the estates' choice of symbolism reflected the *zaman jahilyah* (the pre-Islamic 'days of ignorance'), reflecting the kind of culture and ways of life believed to be thriving within their walls. That the estates were often favoured by expatriates working in multinational corporations and have a high percentage of Christian residents was seen as further proof of their 'depravity'.
67 Only 7.7% in the first post-New Order multi-party election in 1999. Non-participation had risen to close to 30% by the national legislative election of 2009. In the 2014 legislative election it reached 38%.
68 After winning re-election the FPI reported Heryawan to the ombudsman for failing to enforce the Ahmadiyah ban, with Heryawan threatening to ban the FPI after it attacked several Ahmadiyah mosques. He denied entering into any 'agreement' with them, despite it being well publicised at the time. *Beritasatu.com* (2013) 'Ahmad Heryawan: tak ada persetujuan Perda Syariah Islam dengan FPI', 22 February.
69 *Kompas* (2014) 'FPI sebut Risma "Singa Betina" karena berani tutup Dolly', 14 May. For background to the 'conservative turn', see contributors in Bruinnessen 2013.
70 A businesswoman, anti-alcohol and child rights activist and daughter of a former Yudhoyono administration minister for industry, Idris is also chair of the Indonesian Hunters and Shooters Association. *VOA-Islam* (2013) 'Jadi pembela FPI, Fahira Idris puji perjuangan FPI cabut Keppres', 7 July. See also *Kompas* (2014) 'Ini empat anggota DPD terpilih dari DKI Jakarta', 25 April.
71 *Suara Islam* (2014) 'Fahira Idris: dari Twitter menuju Senayan', 31 March.
72 *Arrahmah* (2013) 'Habib Rizieq: Demokrasi lebih bahaya dari babi', 2 April.
73 *Suara-Islam* (2014), 'Pemilu bukan pesta demokrasi tapi momentum rebut kekuasaan', 11 March.
74 *Arrahmah* (2013) 'Sikap FPI pemilu 2014: darurat bagi umat Islam', 31 August.
75 *Tempo* (2013) 'Rizieq Presiden, Suryadharma Ali CalonWakil', 23 August. A former head of the Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation (*Lembaga Bantuan Hukum*or LBH), he was expelled in 2006 after joining the Islamist group Hizbut Tahrir and shifting towards an increasingly radical anti-democratic form of politics. He has been a major financial contributor to the FPI, largely via earnings from his work as a corporate lawyer. His clients have included PT Indocopper Investama, a company owned by Aburizal Bakrie, chairman of Golkar, and one of the main shareholders in the Freeport copper and gold mine in West Papua.
76 This was on the back of Habib Rizieq labelling President Yudhoyono a 'loser' (*pecundang*) for suggesting the FPI should be disbanded if it continued to engage in violent action. *Vivanews* (2013) 'Munarman jadi Caleg PPP', 30 January.
77 *Tempo* (2013) 'Menteri Gamawan: FPI aset yang perlu dipelihara', 24 October.
78 *Kompas* (2014) 'Syarat FPI dukung Prabowo: perda syariah harus diperbanyak', 5 June. A central condition of FPI support was that if elected, Prabowo would increase the number of Syariah-based laws, laws that the FPI would of course be ready to enforce.
79 Interview with Habib Rizieq, Jakarta, 2012.
80 It has at times sought to advertise its nationalist credentials, such as in demonstrations outside the Australian embassy after revelations of spying on Indonesian government ministers. *Jakarta Globe* (2013) 'Australia wiretapping protests continue in Indonesia', 22 November.
81 *Jakarta Post* (2014) 'Hard-line leaders greet Prabowo in Yogyakarta', 2 July.
82 *The Straits Times* (2014) 'Losing is not an option: Indonesia's Prabowo tells ST', 6 June.

83 The SMI was an amalgamation of various silat styles and schools from West Java and West Sumatra. Suharto played a direct role in its formation, persuading masters, often highly protective of their knowledge, to share it 'in the interests of the nation'. Interview with Kasmiri Assabdu, Serang, 1999.
84 I was present at the IPSI election, sitting next to Prabowo. Just prior to the vote he texted each of the IPSI provincial heads seated behind him, turning to nod to each one. It seemed clear that deals had been done to secure their votes. Upon announcement he had won, he promptly got up and left.
85 Interview with Hercules gang member, Jakarta, 2013. According to gang members, Hercules held a strong affinity with orphans and street kids due to his own upbringing, and donated significant amounts of money to various charities.
86 *Jakarta Post* (2005) 'Hercules named suspect in attack on Indo Pos daily', 24 December.
87 *The Age* (2008) 'The gangster and Gusmao', 16 March.
88 *The Age* (2009) 'Dili tycoon deal triggers alarm', 3 May.
89 *The Sun Herald* (2008) 'Soeharto's man suspected', 16 March.
90 When interviewed in 2006, while not specifically naming Prabowo, Hercules made his views clear on the country's military elites, calling them 'liars and thieves who repay loyalty with a kick in the face'. Interview with Hercules, Jakarta, 2006.
91 *Surya Inside* (2012) 'SBY kecewakan Hercules', 20 May.
92 *Harian Umum Sore* (2012) 'Dukung Prabowo jadi Capres, Hercules bentuk GRIB', 19 July.
93 Interview with GRIB official, Jakarta, 2013.
94 Interview with GRIB official, Jakarta, 2013.
95 See for example, *Tribun News* (2013) 'Hercules bagikan 1.000 selimut dan biscuit untuk korban banjir di Pluit', 21 January.
96 Interview with Gerindra official, Jakarta, 2013.
97 Interview with Gerindra official, Jakarta, 2014.
98 Interview with GRIB official, Jakarta, 2014.
99 Interview with GRIB official, Jakarta, 2014.
100 *Merdeka* (2014) 'PoliticalWave: Jokowi diserang 94% kampanye hitam, Prabowo 13%', 5 June.
101 Interview with GRIB official, Jakarta, 2014.
102 Interviews with GRIB members, Jakarta, 2014.
103 *Kompas* (2012) 'Inilah alasan Hercules amankan demo perangkat desa', 14 December.
104 Tedjowulan bestowed over 200 royal titles as a means of consolidating his political support base and financial interests.
105 *Tribun News* (2012) 'Hercules terima gelar bangawan keraton', 5 June.
106 *Kompas* (2014) 'Tedjowulan: Prabowo pantas jadi president karena namanya ada unsur "su"', 5 June.
107 Many of the GRIB members I interviewed cited Hercules's loyalty, honesty and generosity to his followers as reasons why they were attracted to join.
108 *Kompas* (2013) 'Terima kasih Bung Petrus, Si Tito Kei itu sudah dihabisi', 3 June.
109 Interview with police officer, Jakarta, 2012.
110 Interview with police, Jakarta, 2014.
111 West Jakarta has been a stronghold area for Hercules and his gang networks. *Beritasatu.com* (2013) 'Tim Khusus Anti-Preman untuk Oknum, Bukan Ormas', 27 July.
112 Interview with Gerindra official, Jakarta, 2014.
113 *Jakarta Press* (2013) 'Fadli Zon: GRIB Hercules bukan sayap Gerindra', 9 March.

114 *The Jakarta Post* (2013) 'Prabowo backs gang boss in thuggery case', 13 March. GRIB officials stated that they had anticipated that the case would be used as part of 'black campaigning' against Prabowo's presidential bid.
115 *Gatra* (2013) 'Anah buah Hercules terlibat penyekapan & pelecehan wanita pedagang kopi', 17 September.
116 Confidential interview, Jakarta. *Kompas* (2013) 'Hercules bantah anggottanya siksa pedagang di Kebon Jeruk', 16 September.
117 Interview with Rahman, Jakarta, 2014.
118 Interview with GRIB official, Jakarta, 2014.
119 According to reports, Hercules had been paid by the property developer Mitra Abadi Sukses Sejahtera to guard their property. After initially receiving an agreed one-off cheque for Rp.500 million, Hercules was alleged to have demanded continuing payments. *Tempo* (2013) 'Rubrik hukum', 9 December.
120 Hercules's explanation was that it was a contractual misunderstanding and that like many Indonesians, he did not have a bank account so used his wife's instead.
121 *Vivanews* (2014) 'Eksekusi kampus milik Hercules ricuh, 7 mahasiswa ditangkap', 14 May.
122 Interview with GRIB official, Jakarta, 2014.
123 Interview with GRIB official, Jakarta, 2014.
124 *Kompas* (2014) 'Prabowo-Hatta menang telak di Lapas Cipinang', 9 July. They also had an overwhelming victory in a prison for those convicted of corruption and graft.
125 *MetroTV* (2014) 'Hercules imbau capres-cawapres terima apapun hasil pilpres 2014', 9 July.
126 Interview with FBR official, Jakarta, 2014.
127 *Tribun News* (2014) 'FPI, FBR dan Pemuda Pancasila deklarasi dukung Prabowo-Hatta', 31 May. The FBR claimed to have been approached by Joko Widodo's campaign team, but rejected their request for support. It should be noted that while the 'official' stance of these organisations was pro-Prabowo, this was by no means unanimous amongst members. Some FBR gardu, for example, declared their support for Widodo.

8 Conclusion

The politics of protection rackets

The book has endeavoured to outline the patterns of continuity and change in the politics of protection rackets from the New Order into the post-New Order present. If the New Order state functioned as a hub for a structure of rackets with Suharto as the focal source of patronage, there is now a complex and dynamic field of various social interests, actors and agents competing and jostling for rents, representation and legitimacy. What the Jakarta case studies examined in previous chapters suggest is less a case of an unravelling or fragmenting of the state as a coherent coercive entity, but rather its image as such, revealing the multifarious local matrices of power and struggles for authority, resources and legitimacy that collectively constituted it. The political setting, a decentralised and electorally democratic Indonesia, has offered new opportunities for violent entrepreneurs, strongmen and populist militias to access and stake claims to resources, but has also shaped, constrained and in many respects tempered this competition. Similarly, the spatial context of congested, contested and increasingly segregated urban spaces and economies, both formal and informal, has produced particular kinds of political subjects who have sought to assert an invigorated sense of a right to the city, one organisational vehicle of which has been street-based organisations and militias.

In many respects groups such as the FBR embody the contradictions and tensions that have characterised post-New Order Jakarta's street politics. On the one hand they articulate, or at least claim to, the grievances of historically marginalised social and economic groups seeking organisational vehicles by which to address conditions of material deprivation, disadvantage and exclusion. The opportunity exists for an ojek driver or pemulung trash collector to become a branch leader or district coordinator commanding respect and authority, something still largely unimaginable in a political party. Irrespective of ostensive ideological or political orientation, these groups provide networks of solidarity, identity and opportunity structures to fulfil material needs in the context of socioeconomic environments where there is often a distinct paucity of options. They constitute a new kind of political entrepreneurship and mass organisation reflecting a populist political agency of the urban poor and working class shaped by dynamics of democratisation and decentralisation,

while still deeply informed by the logics of coercive territorial politics and the rackets tendency towards monopolisation. Accommodating instrumental and everyday concerns, the streets and kampung rather than the legislature are the central site of political agency and action, being the economic, political and living space for the poor who are structurally absent from institutional power and formal politics. Former middle men and enforcers of the New Order such as Abraham Lunggana, have moved through the ranks of state-backed youth organisation PPM and used their experience and networks as a launching pad into a secure and influential place in regional parliament. However, most by age alone are not remnants of the New Order re-adapting to and taking advantage of the opportunities of electoral democracy and liberalised markets. Lutfi Hakim, for example, was only 22 when the New Order came to an end. The average member of a group such as the FBR or the FPI is in their mid-twenties. These are organisations overwhelmingly made up of youth to whom the New Order is at best a vague memory.

In the crowded neighbourhoods of Jakarta the central focus of politics is to be found in contestations over the use, access and ownership of space, including its moral economy, and here vigilantism, militias and protection-providing groups have proven effective vehicles for gaining instrumental advantage that is simultaneously oppositional, opportunistic and hegemonic. Ethnicity, religion and localism have served as bases for articulating difference as a means of defining a social economy of who has access to what, on what basis and under what circumstances. Through degrees of self-help and organisation, a daily necessity in Jakarta's kampung, providing some 'state-like' services in its home communities, and offering protection both to 'preman' as a social and economic underclass, and from preman as a source of criminality and violence, the FBR and others have been able to sell a protection franchise, appropriating and adapting existing neighbourhood surveillance structures and logics such as Siskamling. The existence of other groups and periodic, almost ritualised, clashes between them over turf can serve both to legitimise and de-legitimise protection arrangements.

The FBR, Forkabi and others may provide opportunity structures and 'protection' for their members and neighbourhoods, but do so in ways that serve to consolidate rather than challenge the prevailing conditions, reproducing the economic marginalisation of their social base, operating as gatekeepers to closed clientelist networks. As has been argued, a primary 'use value' of such groups far more fundamental than that of hired muscle or political gangsterism, roles which, as we have seen, have steadily declined, are the ways in which the political agency of disenfranchised urban populations is shaped, channelled and constrained through and by them. There is a vested structural interest in suppressing counter-hegemonic forces that may challenge economic and social monopolies, such as trade unions or non-sectarian class-based urban poor organisations or movements. Schulte-Bockholt's theory of rackets argues that in order to consolidate power elites' attempts to incorporate potentially disruptive sub-hegemonic groups such as gangs within

clientelist networks of economic advantage, in doing so expands the dominating class across conventional class lines, in what he calls a 'structure of rackets rooted in a specific mode of production' (Schulte-Bockholt 2006, 27). Organisations such as the FPI and FBR are largely untethered from the direct control of the military or police, but to the extent that they reproduce a 'state-like' role of maintaining social and political order largely amenable to the interests of political elites and business, and constitute valuable 'partners', even 'national assets', which can be granted economic and political concessions.

Hence we find the coexistence of seemingly contradictory ventures within a single gang or organisation: semi-organised criminal and predatory behaviour as a means of primitive accumulation; forms of political organisation, consciousness and agency on the part of members; and utilitarian alliances with local or national political elites. The racket as a relationship of domination has manifested in post-New Order Jakarta in this peculiar brand of populist racketeering, informed by the New Order but shaped by decentralisation. Over time the groups that have come to dominate the protection economy have been those that have been able to negotiate relations of exchange and accommodation with other political and economic interests and manufacture a degree of legitimacy amongst segments of the urban underclasses. The most successful organisational and political strategies in consolidating protection market niches combine populist claims and grievances with the accommodation of pragmatic instrumental concerns, and the imposition of 'reasonable' protection regimes conducive to commerce and big business, and to a lesser extent those of informal traders and vendors. This has constituted the foundation of claims of being a legitimate 'stabilising' force in the city.

There remain not-infrequent calls for ormas and militias to be disbanded, such as in 2012 when there was an upsurge in public anti-FPI sentiment. Parliamentary committees have considered proposals to change ormas laws, problematic due to the broader implications these held for the freedom to organise (Wilson and Nugroho 2012). Perhaps of more concern are advocates within government and segments of the middle class for a return to a Petrus-style approach to the 'preman problem'.[1] The killing in Yogyakarta of four men in police detention by Kopassus soldiers in 2013, for example, alleged retribution for the murder of their comrade, saw waves of vocal public support for the revival of extrajudicial methods (Supriatma 2014). That such tactics were fundamental to the institutionalisation of preman during the New Order and subsequent intertwinement with the political interests of elite patrons and benefactors, suggests that the 'problem' is still seen not as one of preman per se, but of those who operate outside organised and manageable frameworks. The anti-preman campaigns detailed in Chapter 6 have arguably served a similar purpose, minus the use of state-sanctioned murder, consolidating and managing the main players and tacitly granting concessions to govern informal street economies while criminalising the more unruly 'loose kites'. Broader structures, however, are kept intact.

Wilson and Nugroho (2012) argue perceptively that an emphasis upon a 'rule of law' approach towards militia and ormas risks mistaking the symptoms for the causes of their popularity and influence. Unsurprisingly, calls for stricter law enforcement often come from those with sufficient social or political capital to ensure that it protects their interests, such as the city's politically conservative middle class. In a context where the law and its enforcers, such as the police, routinely discriminate against the poor, ormas and militias will remain a viable alternative source of protection. The market demand for the services that violent entrepreneurs provide arises largely from the middle class and elites themselves, including major financial institutions and government agencies. Liberalised financial markets with unreliable or costly arbitration mechanisms generate a self-perpetuating demand for those proficient in resolving a range of 'transactional problems' such as debt collection and contract enforcement. The problem lies less with the enforcers, than with social and economic interests employing their violence as a means of gaining economic advantage.

If there are positives to be taken from the cases in this book, it is that the more overt and widespread violence and coercion of the past is not likely to become a feature of contemporary Jakarta's urban politics. In fact, for the most part Jakarta remains relatively free of anything resembling the scale and intensity of disruption and conflict linked to gangs and militias in other parts of the world. This can partly be attributed to the relative consolidation of the institutions and social norms of electoral democracy which, despite ongoing challenges such as corruption and entrenched oligarchies, have made violence if not redundant as a political and economic strategy, at least one where the risks often outweigh potential gains. It is also an outcome of the political economy of protection markets, where the presence of multiple providers has tended to reduce the competitive advantage of reliance upon violence above other strategies and a tendency towards monopolisation which reduces the overall costs of producing protection.

The most significant challenge posed to militias, populist racketeers and their patrons is the counter-hegemonic social forces that they seek to suppress or co-opt, such as class-based forms of grass-roots organisation and mobilisation of the poor. These still face significant obstacles, as Lane (2014) and Hadiz (2011a) have documented. On another front, however, is the rise of politicians and a politics that appeals and speaks directly to the concerns and needs of the poor and working class, such as the provision of accessible health care, education, social protection, state-subsidised housing, the integration of informal economic activity into city planning, and tackling the corruption of government functionaries and elites which has crippled the state's ability to deliver any of these effectively.

The 2014 presidential elections posed a choice between two starkly different candidates and, in some respects, types of politics. The populist governor of Jakarta, Joko Widodo, considered a progressive reformer free of ties to the previous regime or the taint of corruption, campaigned on a platform of pro-

poor and 'people-centric' social and economic policies. This contrasted with the aggressive nationalism and patronage-based authoritarianism of former New Order military strongman Prabowo Subianto. As discussed in the previous chapter, the leaders of all of the large ormas and militias in Jakarta very publicly aligned themselves with Prabowo. This was in part an exaggerated attempt to seek favour from the candidate who appeared most likely to deliver concrete material returns for their contingent loyalty and ideologically inclined to integrate them into state structures. Some operated as field coordinators for his coalition's virulent 'black campaigns', including attempts to discredit Widodo as 'communist' and a closet Christian. The participatory, non-sectarian and pro-poor politics that many, rightly or wrongly, saw Widodo as representing constituted a distinct threat insofar as it was a politics that bypassed them as mediators and brokers between the kampung, urban poor and the state, potentially undermining the racket relationship and the authority and networks of economic advantage that stemmed from it. As one militia leader bluntly put it when asked about the possible consequences of a Widodo win for his organisation, 'it could mean the end of us'.[2]

The resilience and adaptability of rackets means that while the fates of individual organisations and particular networks may fluctuate, the racket itself as an 'archetype of domination' is unlikely to disappear. Yet if this kind of politics can move beyond populist rhetoric and go some way to tackling the structural conditions reproducing poverty and social and political exclusion, it may help provide a greater field of options for the urban poor beyond those of joining gangs or militias, or the space in which these can be transformed into more directly representative social movements of the street.

Notes

1 *Aktual* (2013) 'Fuad: aksi Kopassus tumpas preman patut diapresiasi', 6 April.
2 Interview, Jakarta, 2014.

Glossary

AAK Aliansi Anti-Komunis (Anti-Communist Alliance)
Amar makruf nahi mungkar Quranic edict of commanding the good, forbidding the bad
AmKey Ikatan Pemuda Maluku Tenggara di Jakarta (Central Moluccan Youth in Jakarta)
AMPI Angkatan Muda Pembaharuan Indonesia (Indonesian Youth Renewal Generation)
AMS Angkatan Muda Siliwangi (Siliwangi Youth)
AMSI Asosiasi Manager Security Indonesia (Indonesian Association of Security Managers)
angkot angkutan kota (city minibus)
Ansor youth organisation of the Nahdatul Ulama
BAKIN Badan Koordinasi Intelijen Negara (National Intelligence Coordination Body)
Bamus Betawi Badan Musyarawah Betawi (Betawi Consultative Body)
Banpol Bantuan Polisi (Police Assistant)
Banser Barisan Ansor Serba Guna (paramilitary unit of Ansor affiliated with the Nahdatul Ulama)
becak pedicab
beking 'backing' (lit.), a patronage relationship
Betawi indigenous ethnic group of Jakarta
BPPKB Badan Pembinaan Potensi Keluarga Besar Banten (Body for the Guidance of the Potential of the Banten Family)
bupati regent
calo ticket scalper
dedengkot 'big shot', leader
desa village, hamlet
DPD Dewan Perwakilan Daerah (Regional Representative Council)
DPR Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat (People's Representative Council)
DPRD Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah (Regional People's Representative Council)
FBR Forum Betawi Rempug (Betawi Brotherhood Forum)

FKGMB Forum Komunikasi Generasi Muda Betawi (Youth Generation Betawi Communication Forum)
FKPPI Forum Komunikasi Putra Putri Indonesia (Forum of the Sons and Daughters of Retired Military)
Forkabi Forum Komunikasi Anak Betawi (Betawi Communication Forum)
FPI Front Pembela Islam (Defenders of Islam Front)
FSPMI Federasi Serikat Pekerja Metal Indonesia (Indonesian Federation of Metal Workers Unions)
Gada Paksi Garda Muda Penegak Integrasi (Youth Guard Upholding Integration, pro-Indonesian militia in East Timor)
gali 'gabungan anak liar', 'gangs of wild children' (term for a petty criminal or thug)
gardu guard house or command post
Gerindra Gerakan Indonesia Raya (Great Indonesia Movement)
Golkar Golongan Karya (Functional Groups, the New Order period ruling party)
golok machete
GRIB Gerakan Rakyat Indonesia Baru (People's Movement for a New Indonesia)
habib Islamic scholars of Indonesian-Arab descent
Hansip Pertahanan Sipil (Civilian security guard unit)
haram prohibited within Islam
HKBP Huria Kristen Batak Protestan (Batak Protestant Parish)
Ikamra Ikatan keluarga Madura (Family of Madura Association)
IKB Ikatan Keluarga Betawi (Family of Betawi Association)
IKBT Ikatan Keluarga Besar Tanah Abang (Family of Tanah Abang Association)
IKJB Ikatan Keluarga Besar Jati Baru (Family of Jatibaru Association)
IPK Ikatan Pemuda Karya (Association of Functional Group Youths)
IPKI Ikatan Pendukung Kemerdekaan Indonesia (Association for the Supporters of Indonesian Independence)
IPSI Ikatan Pencak Silat Indonesia (Indonesian Pencak Silat Association)
Iwarda Ikatan Warga Djakarta Asli (Original Residents of Jakarta Association)
Jabodetabek Jakarta Bogor Bekasi Tangerang Bekasi (Greater Jakarta region)
jago fighting cock (lit.), tough guy, strongman
jawara champion, martial arts expert
kabupaten regency
kampung informal community or neighbourhood
Kamra Keamanan Rakyat (People's Security)
kebal invulnerability
kepala desa village head
KNPI Komite Nasional Pemuda Indonesia (Indonesian National Youth Committee)

Kobra A Jakarta gang active from the early 1940s until the 1960s, most members of which were former independence fighters
KONI Komite Olahraga Nasional Indonesia (Indonesian National Sports Commission)
Kopassus Komando Pasukan Khusus (Indonesian Special Forces Command)
Kopkamtib Komando Pemulihan Keamanan dan Ketertiban (Commander of the Command for the Restoration of Security and Public Order)
Kostrad Komando Cadangan Strategis Angkatan Darat (Army Strategic Reserve Command)
KPU Komisi Pemilihan Umum (Indonesian Electoral Commission)
kyai leader of an Islamic boarding school
laskar militia, militia member
Laskar Jayakarta Jayakarta Militia (a Jakarta-based Betawi militia group)
Laskar Merah Putih Red and White Militia (a nationalist militia)
maksiat sin, vice
Matrik Keamanan Distrik (District Civil Security Unit)
mufakat consent
MUI Majelis Ulama Indonesia (Indonesian Council of Islamic Scholars)
musyawarah consensus via deliberation
New Order The era of the Suharto regime, 1966–98
NGO nongovernmental organisation
NU Nahdatul Ulama, 'Revival of Religious Scholars' (lit.), organisation representing Islamic traditionalism
ojek motorcycle taxi
oknum 'rogue element'
Ormas Organisasi Masyarakat (societal organisation)
OTB Organisasi Tanpa Bentuk (Organisation Without Form)
Pagar Nusa Fence of the Archipelago (martial arts school affiliated with the Nahdatul Ulama)
Pak Ogah informal traffic warden
Pamswakarsa Pasukan Pengamanan Swakarsa (Voluntary Security Forces)
PAN Partai Amanat Nasional (National Mandate Party)
Pancasila Five guiding principles of the Indonesian state
Pangdam Jaya Panglima Daerah Militer Jakarta (Jakarta Military Command Chief)
panglima perang war commander
pangreh praja 'rulers of the realm', administrative corps
pasar market
PDI Partai Demokrasi Indonesia (Indonesian Democratic Party)
PDI-P Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan (Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle)
Pecalang a traditional security guard in Bali
pemulung trash collector
pencak silat Malay martial art

pendekar martial arts master
Perbepsi Persatuan Bekas Pejuang Seluruh Indonesia (Indonesian Association for Former Freedom Fighters)
pesantren traditional Islamic boarding school
Petrus Penembakan Misterius (Mysterious Shootings)
PI Pasukan Istimewa ('Special Forces')
PKB Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa (National Awakening Party)
PKI Partai Komunis Indonesia (Indonesian Communist Party)
PKS Partai Keadilan Sejahtera (Prosperity and Justice Party)
PMKS Penyandang Masalah Kesejahteraan Sosial (social welfare problem)
PNI Partai Nasionalis Indonesia (Indonesian Nationalist Party)
posko pos komando (command post)
PP Pemuda Pancasila (Pancasila Youth)
PPM Pemuda Panca Marga (Panca Marga Youth)
PPP Partai Persatuan Pembangunan (United Development Party)
PPSBBI Persatuan Persilatan dan Seni Budaya Banten Indonesia (Indonesian Association of Bantenese Silat and Culture)
PRD Partai Rakyat Demokratik (People's Democratic Party)
preman thug, gangster
pungli pungutan liar (illegal fee, extortion fee)
Rakyat 'The People'
razia raid
ronda malam neighbourhood night watch
RT Rukun Tetangga (administrative unit consisting of 30–50 households)
RW Rukun Warga (administrative unit consisting of several RT)
Satgas Satuan Tugas (taskforce, often referring to a political party paramilitary)
Satpam Satuan Pengamanan (Security Unit, security guard)
Satpol PP Satuan polisi pamong praja (Civil Service Police Unit)
setoran deposit or fee, including those extracted illegally
Si Pitung Social bandit culture hero from Betawi folklore
Siskamling sistem keamanan lingkungan (environment security system)
SMI Satria Muda Indonesia (Indonesian Young Knights)
SMID Solidaritas Mahasiswa Indonesia untuk Demokrasi (Indonesian Students' Solidarity for Democracy)
SPRIM Solidaritas Perjuangan Rakyat Indonesia untuk Maubere (Indonesians in Solidarity Struggle with the Maubere People)
SPSI Serikat Pekerja Seluruh Indonesia (All Indonesia Workers Union)
TBO Tenaga Bantuan Operasi (Operations Assistant)
TNI Tentara Nasional Indonesia (Indonesian National Military)
Tramtib Kantor Ketentraman dan Ketertiban (Peace and Order Guard)
ulama Islamic scholar
UPC Urban Poor Consortium
VOC Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie (Dutch East India Company)

Bibliography

Abe, I., Kiyohara, K. and Nakajima, K. (1992) 'Fascism, sport and society in Japan', *International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1–28.

Abeyasekere, S. (1984) 'Overview of the history of Jakarta, 1930s to 1970s', in Abeyasekere, S. (ed.) *From Batavia to Jakarta: Indonesia's capital 1930s to 1980s, AIA-CSEAS Winter Lecture Series for 1984*, Monash University, 1–24.

Abeyasekere, S. (1987) *Jakarta: a history*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Abrahams, R. (1998) *Vigilant citizens: vigilantism and the state*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Aditjondro, G. (2001) 'Guns, pamphlets and handy-talkies', in Wessel, L. and Wimhofer, G. (eds), *Violence in Indonesia*, Hamburg: Abera-Verl, 100–128.

Agustino, L. and Yousoff, M.A. (2010) 'Pilkada dan pemekaran daerah dalam demokrasi local di Indonesia: local strongmen dan roving bandits', *Jebat: Malaysian Journal of History, Politics & Strategic Studies*, vol. 37: 86–104.

Ajidarma, G., Saptono, I. and Suwarso, L. (eds) (1997) *Peristiwa 27 Juli*, Jakarta: Institut Studi Arus Informasi, Aliansi Jurnalis Independen.

Ajidarma, S.G. (2002) 'Dari Jakarta', *Djakarta: The City Life Magazine*, 21 July.

Alter, J. (1994) 'Somatic nationalism: Indian wrestling and militant Hinduism', *Modern Asian Studies*, vol. 28, no. 3, 557–588.

al-Zastrouw, N. (2006) *Gerakan Islam simbolik: politik kepentingan FPI*, Yogyakarta: LKiS.

Anderson, B.R.O.G. (1983) 'Old state, new society: Indonesia's New Order in comparative historical perspective', *Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. 42, 477–496.

Anderson, B.R.O.G. (2001) 'Introduction', in Anderson, B.R.O.G. (ed.), *Violence and the state in Suharto's Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asia Program Publications, 9–19.

Anderson, B. and Snyder, J. (2013) 'Coming of age in the urban kampung: gang demographics and territories in select Jakarta neighborhoods – preliminary findings', paper prepared for the 7th Annual European Association for South East Asian Studies Conference, School of Social and Political Sciences, Technical University of Lisboa (ISCSP/UTL), Lisbon, Portugal, 2–5 July.

Asgart, S.M. (2003) 'The phenomenon of paramilitary organizations: case studies of six organizations', in Prasetyo, S., Priyono, A.E. and Törnquist, O. (eds), *Indonesia's post-Soeharto democracy movement*, Jakarta: Demos, 643–667.

Aspinall, E. (2013) 'Popular agency and interests in Indonesia's democratic transition and consolidation', *Indonesia*, vol. 96, 101–122.

Aspinall, E. (2014) 'Money politics', *Inside Indonesia*, no. 116, April–June, at www.insideindonesia.org/weekly-articles/money-politics-2 (accessed 15 June 2014).

Aspinall, E. and Mietzner, M. (2014) 'Prabowo Subianto: vote for me, but just the once', *New Mandala*, 30 June at www.asiapacific.anu.edu.au/newmandala/2014/06/30/prabowo-subianto-vote-for-me-but-just-the-once/ (accessed 30 June 2014).

Aziz, A. (1998) *Islam and masyarakat Betawi*, Ciputat: PT Logos Wacana Ilmu.

Badan Pusat Statistik (2007) 'Labor force situation in Indonesia', Jakarta: BPS.

Baker, J. (2008) 'A sibling rivalry', *Inside Indonesia*, no. 93, August–September, at www.insideindonesia.org/feature-editions/a-sibling-rivalry (accessed 5 May 2014).

Baker, J. (2013) 'The Parman economy: post-authoritarian shifts in the off-budget economy of Indonesia's security institutions', *Indonesia*, vol. 96, 123–150.

Barker, J. (1998) '"State of fear" controlling the criminal contagion in Suharto's New Order', *Indonesia*, no. 66, October, 7–42.

Barker, J. (1999) 'Surveillance and territoriality in Bandung', in Rafael, V. (ed.), *Figures of criminality in Indonesia, the Philippines and colonial Vietnam*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 95–127.

Barker, J. (2007) 'Vigilantes and the state', in Day, T. (ed.), *Identifying with freedom: Indonesia after Suharto*, New York: Berghahn Books, 87–94.

Barker, J. (2009) 'Negara Beling: street-level authority in an Indonesian slum', in Barker, J. and Klinken, G. van (eds), *State of authority: the state in society in Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 17–46.

Barker, J. and Klinken, G. van (2009) 'Reflections on the state in Indonesia', in Barker, J. and Klinken, G. van (eds), *State of authority: the state in society in Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 17–46.

Batalas, A. (2003) 'Send a thief to catch a thief: state building and the employment of irregular military formations in mid-nineteenth-century Greece', in Davis, D. and Pereira, A. (eds), *Irregular armed forces and their role in politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 149–177.

Bertrand, J. (2004a) *Nationalism and ethnic conflict in Indonesia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bertrand, R. (2004b) 'Behave like enraged lions: civil militias, the army and the criminalization of politics in Indonesia', *Global Crime*, vol. 6, no. 3–4, 325–344.

Bertrand, R. (2010) 'Governor Sutiyoso's "war on vice": criminal enterprises, Islamist militias, and political power in Jakarta', in Briquet, J.L. and Favsareal-Garrigues, G. (eds), *Organized crime and states: the hidden face of politics*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 73–97.

Blok, A. (1988) *The mafia of a Sicilian village, 1860–1960: a study of violent peasant entrepreneurs*, New York: Waveland Press.

Bourchier, D. (1994) 'Crime, law and state authority in Indonesia', in Budiman, A. (ed.), *State and civil society in Indonesia, Centre for Southeast Asian Studies*, Clayton: Monash University Press, 177–212.

Brotherton, D. (2007) 'Towards the gang as a social movement', in Hagedorn, J.M. (ed.), *Gangs in the global city: alternatives to traditional criminology*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 251–272.

Brotherton, D.C. and Barrios, L. (2004) *The Almighty Latin King and Queen Nation: street politics and the transformation of a New York gang*, New York: Colombia University Press.

Brown, D. and Wilson, I.D. (2007) 'Ethnicised gang violence in Indonesia: where criminals and fanatics meet', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, vol. 13, no. 3, 367–403.

Bruinnessen, M. van (ed.) (2013) *Contemporary developments in Indonesian Islam: explaining the 'conservative turn'*, Singapore: ISEAS.

Buehler, M. (2007) 'Local elite reconfiguration in post-New Order Indonesia: the 2005 election of district government heads in South Sulawesi', *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs*, vol. 41, no. 1, 119–147.

Butt, S. (2014) 'Returning to the 1945 Constitution: what does it mean?' *New Mandala*, 18 June at www.asiapacific.anu.edu.au/newmandala/2014/06/18/returning-to-the-1945-constitution-what-does-it-mean/ (accessed 19 June 2014).

Castells, M. (2009) *The rise of network society: the Information Age: economy, society and culture, Volume 1*, Malden: Blackwell.

Castles, L. (1967) 'The ethnic profile of Jakarta', *Indonesia*, vol. 3, April, 153–204.

Centeno, M.A. and Portes, A. (2006) 'The informal economy in the shadow of the state', in Fernandez-Kelly, P. and Shefner, J. (eds), *Out of the shadows: political action and the informal economy in Latin America*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 22–48.

Cribb, R. (1984) 'Elections in Jakarta', *Asian Survey*, vol. 24, 655–664.

Cribb, R. (1991) *Gangsters and revolutionaries: the Jakarta people's militia and the Indonesian revolution 1945–1949*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Cribb, R. (2003) 'From Petrus to Ninja: death squads in Indonesia', in Campbell, Bruce B. and Brenner, Arthur D. (eds), *Death squads in global perspective: murder with deniability*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 181–202.

Davis, D. and Pereira, A. (eds) (2003) *Irregular armed forces and their role in politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Day, T. (2002) *Fluid iron: state formation in Southeast Asia*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Dichiara, A. and Chabot, R. (2003) 'Gangs and contemporary urban struggle: an unappreciated aspect of gangs', in Kontos, L., Brotherton, D. and Barrios, L. (eds), *Gangs and society: alternative perspectives*, New York: Colombia University Press, 77–94.

Djani, L., Masduki, T. and Wilson, I.D. (2009) 'Governing favors: an investigation of accountability mechanisms in local budget allocation in Indonesia', Australia Indonesia Research Partnership Policy Brief 8, Canberra: The Australian National University.

Dwipayana, G. and Ramadhan K.H. (1989) *Soeharto, pikiran, ucapan dan tindakan saya: otobiografi*, Jakarta: Citra Lamtoro Gung Persada.

Eklof, S. (1999) *Indonesian politics in crisis: the long fall of Suharto 1996–98*, Copenhagen: NIAS Press.

Elias, N. (1995) *The civilizing process, Volume 1*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Elias, N. and Dunning, E. (1986) *Quest for excitement: sport and leisure in the civilizing process*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Elmhirst, R. (2001) 'Resource struggles and the politics of place in North Lampung, Indonesia', *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, vol. 21, no. 3, 284–306.

Farid, H. (2006) 'Political economy of violence and victims in Indonesia', in Coppel, C.A. (ed.), *Violent conflicts in Indonesia: analysis, representation, resolution*, New York: Routledge, 269–285.

Fauzi, M. (2004) 'Lain di front lain di kota: jagoan and bajingan di Jakarta tahun 1950-an', paper presented at the 1st International Urban Conference, Airlangga University, Surabaya, 23–24 August.

Fealy, G. and McGregor, K.E. (2010) 'Nahdatul Ulama and the killings of 1965–66: religion, politics and remembrance', *Indonesia*, vol. 89, 37–60.

Firman, T. (1999) 'From global city to "city in crisis": Jakarta metropolitan region under economic turmoil', *Habitat International*, vol. 23, no. 4, 447–466.

Firman, T. (2004) 'Major issues in Indonesia's urban land development', *Land Use Policy*, vol. 21, 347–355.

Firman, T. (2013) 'Territorial splits (pemekaran daerah) in decentralising Indonesia, 2000–2012: Local Development Drivers or Hindrance?' *Space and Polity*, vol. 17, no. 2, 180–196.

Forum Betawi Rempug (2002) 'Memperkenalkan Forum Betawi Rempug', internal ms., Jakarta.

Frederick, W. (2002) 'Some patterns of violence in the Indonesian revolution, 1945–1949', in Freek Colombijn, F. and Lindblad, J.T. (eds), *Roots of Violence in Indonesia: contemporary violence in historical perspective*, Leiden: KITLV Press, 143–172.

Friend, T. (2003) *Indonesian destinies*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Froio, N. (2014) 'Brazil's favelas are in big trouble, despite the World Cup marketing push', *The Guardian*, 18 May.

Gambetta, D. (1993) *The Sicilian Mafia: the business of private protection*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gunawan, F.X.R. and Patria, N. (2000) *Premanisme politik*, Jakarta: Institut Studi Arus Informasi.

Hadiz, V.R. (2003) 'Local power: decentralisation and political reorganisation in Indonesia', paper presented at 'Globalisation, Conflict and Political Regimes in East and Southeast Asia' conference, Asia Research Centre, Murdoch University, Western Australia, 15–16 August.

Hadiz, V.R. (2011a) *Localising power in post-authoritarian Indonesia: a Southeast Asia perspective*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Hadiz, V.R. (2011b) 'Indonesian political Islam: capitalist development and the legacies of the Cold War', *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, vol. 30, no. 1, 3–38.

Hadiz, V.R. and Robison, R. (2003) 'Neo-liberal reforms and illiberal consolidations: the Indonesian paradox', The Southeast Asia Research Centre (SEARC) of the City University of Hong Kong, Working Paper Series no. 52, September.

Hadiz, V.R. and Robison, R. (2004) *Reorganising power in Indonesia: the politics of oligarchy in an age of markets*, London and New York: Routledge Curzon.

Hagedorn, J.M. (2007) 'Gangs, institutions, race and space: The Chicago School revisited', in Hagedron, J.M. (ed.), *Gangs in the global city: alternatives to traditional criminology*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 13–33.

Hagedorn, J.M. (2008) *World of gangs: armed young men and gangsta culture*, Minnesota and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Hamid, A. and Masaaki, O. (2008) 'Jawara in power, 1999–2007', *Indonesia*, vol. 86, 109–138.

Hargreaves, J. (ed.) (1982) *Sport, culture and ideology*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Harsanto, D. (2005) 'Jakarta to make unskilled migrants feel unwelcome', *The Jakarta Post*, 9 November.

Hartmann, A. and von Lampe, K. (2008) 'The German underworld and the Ringvereine from the 1890s through the 1950s', *Global Crime*, vol. 9, no. 1–2, 108–135.

Hasani, I. and Naipospos, B.T. (eds) (2011) *The faces of Islam 'defenders': religion radicalism and its implications on assurance of religious/beliefs freedom in Jabodetabek and West Java*, Jakarta: Pustaka Masyarakat Setara.

Heryanto, A. and Hadiz, V. (2005) 'Post-authoritarian Indonesia: a comparative Southeast Asian perspective', *Critical Asian Studies*, vol. 32, no. 5, 251–275.

Hess, H. (1986) 'The Traditional Sicilian Mafia: Organized Crime and Repressive Crime', in Kelly, Robert J. (ed.), *Organized crime: a global perspective*, New Jersey: Rowman & Littlefield, 113–133.

Human Rights Watch (2006) 'Condemned communities: forced evictions in Jakarta', vol. 18, no. 10 (C).

Humphrey, H. (1999) 'Russian protection rackets and the appropriation of law and order', in Heyman, J. McC. (ed.), *States and illegal practices*, Oxford: Berg, 199–232.

Imparsial (2009) 'Quo vadis Satpol PP di era reformasi', Jakarta: Imparsial.

International Crisis Group (2003) 'The perils of private security in Indonesia: guards and militias on Bali and Lombok', *Asia Report* no. 67, Jakarta/Brussels.

International Crisis Group (2010) 'Indonesia: "Christianisation" and intolerance', *Asia Briefing* no. 114, Jakarta/Brussels.

Jellinek, L. (1991) *The wheel of fortune: the history of a poor community in Jakarta*, Sydney: Asian Studies Association of Australia.

Jessop, B. (2012) 'Marxist approaches to power', in Nash, K. and Scott, A. (eds), *The Wiley-Blackwell companion to political sociology*, Oxford: Blackwell, 3–14.

Kelly, T. and Shah, A. (2006) 'Introduction: A double-edged sword: Protection and state violence', *Critique of Anthropology*, vol. 26, no. 3, 251–257.

King, P. (2003) 'Putting the (para) military back into politics: the "taskforces" of the political parties', *Inside Indonesia*, January/March, at www.insideindonesia.org/weekly-articles/putting-the-para-military-back-into-politics (accessed 10 May 2014).

Klinken, G. van (2002) 'Indonesia's new ethnic elites', in Schulte Nordholt, H. and Irwan Abdullah, I. (eds), *Indonesia: in search of transition*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 67–105.

Klinken, G. van (2007) *Communal violence and democratization in Indonesia: small town wars*, New York: Routledge.

Klinken, H. van (2012) *Making them Indonesians: child transfers out of East Timor*, Melbourne: Monash University Publishing.

Knoerr, J. (2006) 'Orang Betawi: popularization and politicization of a creole notion of Jakartan identity', *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*, vol. 30.

Knoerr, J. (2014) *Creole Identity in Post-Colonial Indonesia*, New York: Berghahn.

Koonings, K. and Kruijt, D. (eds) (2004) *Armed actors: organised violence and state failure in Latin America*, London: Zed Books.

Kreuzer, P. (2009) 'Private political violence and Boss-rule in the Philippines', *Behemoth: A Journal on Civilisation*, vol. 1, 47–63.

Kristiansen, S. and Trijono, L. (2005) 'Authority and law enforcement: local government reforms and security systems in Indonesia', *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, vol. 27, no. 2, 236–254.

Kroef, J.M. van der (1984) 'Petrus; patterns of prophylactic murder in Indonesia', *Asian Survey*, no. 7, July, 745–759.

Kusno, A. (2004) 'Whither nationalist urbanism? Public life in Governor Sutiyoso's Jakarta', *Urban Studies*, vol. 41, no. 12, 2377–2394.

Kusno, A. (2010) *The appearances of memory: mnemonic practices of architecture and urban form in Indonesia*, London and Durham: Duke University Press Books.

Lane, F.C. (1979) *Profits from power; readings in protection rent and violence-controlling enterprises*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lane, M. (2014) *Decentralization and its discontents: an essay on class, political agency and national perspective in Indonesian politics*, Singapore: ISEAS.

Latham, R. (2000) 'Social sovereignty', *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 17, no. 4, 1–18.

Lee, M. (2004) 'Exploring political violence in Southeast Asia: who controls Indonesia's Satgas Parpol?' Unpublished Master's thesis, National University of Singapore.

Leisch, H. (2002) 'Gated communities in Indonesia', *Cities*, vol. 19, no. 5, 341–350.

Lev, D.S. (1999) 'The criminal regime: criminal process in Indonesia', in Rafael, V.L. (ed.), *Figures of criminality in Indonesia, the Philippines, and colonial Vietnam*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 175–192.

Lindsey, T. (2001) 'The criminal state: premanisme and the New Indonesia', in Lloyd, G. and Smith, S.L. (eds), *Indonesia today: challenges of history*, Singapore: ISEAS Press, 283–297.

Lindsey, T. (2006) 'From Soepomo to Prabowo: law, violence and corruption in the preman state', in Coppel, C. (ed.), *Violent conflicts in Indonesia: analysis, representation, resolution*, London: Curzon, 19–36.

Lucas, A. (1991) *One soul, one struggle: region and revolution in Indonesia*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

MacDougall, J.M. (2003) 'ICG Preman Report', unpublished paper.

MacDougall, J.M. (2007) 'Criminality and the political economy of security in Lombok', in Schulte Nordholt, N. and Klinken, G. van (eds), *Renegotiating Boundaries: local politics in post-Suharto Indonesia*, Leiden: KITLV Press, 281–306.

Mangan, J.A. (ed.) (2003) *Militarism, sport, Europe: war without weapons*, London: Frank Cass.

Maryono, O. (1998) *Pencak silat; merentang waktu*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Masaaki, O. (2004) 'Local politics in decentralized Indonesia: the Governor General of Banten Province', *IIAS Newsletter*, no. 34, July.

Masaaki, O. (2006) 'Broker keamanan di Jakarta; yang profesional dan yang berbasis massa', in Masaaki, O. and Rozaki, A. (eds), *Kelompok kekerasan dan bos lokal di era reformasi*, Yogyakarta: CSES and IRE Press, 1–19.

Masaaki, O. and Rozaki, A. (2006) 'Pengantar editor', in Masaaki, O. and Rozaki, A. (eds), *Kelompok kekerasan dan bos lokal di era reformasi*, Yogyakarta: CSES and IRE Press, ix–xxii.

Meliala, A. (1998) *Bagaimana preman dan premanisme hidup di Jakarta*, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Depok: Universitas Indonesia.

Mietzner, M. (2013) *Money, power and ideology: political parties in post-authoritarian Indonesia*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Miftahuddin (2004) *Radikalisasi pemuda: PRD melawan tirani*, Jakarta: Desantara.

Migdal, J. (2001) *State in society: studying how states and societies transform and constitute on another*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, A.J. (1991) *No money no honey: a study of street traders and prostitutes in Jakarta*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nurbianto, B. (2003) 'Sutiyoso unveils statue amid water crisis, evictions', *Jakarta Post*, 11 November.

OHCHR (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights) (2013) 'Media statement: United Nations Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context', Jakarta, 11 June, at www.ohchr.org/CH/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=13434&LangID=C (accessed 10 July 2014).

O'Rourke, K. (2002) *Reformasi: the struggle for power in post-Soeharto Indonesia*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

PB IPSI (Pengurus Besar Ikatan Pencak Silat Indonesia (1994) 'Khazanah pencak silat', unpublished manuscript.

Pearlman, J. (2009) 'Megacity's violence and its consequences in Rio de Janeiro', in Koonings, K. and Kruijt, D. (eds), *Megacities: the politics of violence and urban exclusion in the global South*, London and New York: Zed Books, 52–68.

Pemberton, J. (1994) *On the subject of 'Java'*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Pramoedya Ananta Toer (2000) *Tales from Djakarta: Caricatures of circumstances and their human beings*, Jakarta: Equinox Publishing.

Purdey, J. (2006) *Anti-Chinese violence in Indonesia, 1996–1999*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Purnomo, A.B. (2004) *Peta konflik Jakarta: warga, mahasiswa, preman, suku, negara dan warga*, Jakarta: YAPPIKA.

Rizieq, H.M.S. (2012) *Wawasan kebangsaan menuju NKRI bersyariah*, Jakarta: Suara Islam Press.

Robinson, G. (1995) *The dark side of paradise: political violence in Bali*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Rodgers, D. (2004) 'Old wine in new bottles or new wine in old? Conceptualizing violence and governmentality in contemporary Latin America', Crisis States Research Centre, discussion paper no. 6.

Rodgers, D. (2006) 'The state as a gang: conceptualizing the governmentality of violence in contemporary Nicaragua', *Critique of Anthropology*, vol. 26, no. 3, 315–330.

Ryter, L. (1998) 'Pemuda Pancasila: the last loyalist free men of Suharto's order?' *Indonesia*, no. 66, 45–73.

Ryter, L. (2005) 'Reformasi gangsters: preman have had to change to stay in business', *Inside Indonesia*, no. 82, March–June at www.insideindonesia.org/weekly-articles/reformasi-gangsters (accessed 1 May 2014).

Ryter, L. (2009) 'Their moment in the sun: the new Indonesian parliamentarians from the old OKP', in Barker, J. and Klinken, J. van (eds), *State of Authority: the state in society in Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 181–218.

Ryter, L. (2012) 'Privateers, politicians, prowess and power', in Chua, L., Cook, J., Long, N. and Wilson, L. (eds), *Southeast Asian perspectives on power*, New York: Routledge, 107–118.

Salim, H. (2004) *Kelompok paramiliter NU*, Yogyakarta: LKiS.

Sanchez-Jankowski, M. (2003) 'Gangs and social change', *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 7, no. 2, 191–216.

Sassen, S. (2003) 'Globalization or denationalization?' *Review of International Political Economy*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1–22.

Schulte-Bockholt, A. (2006) *The politics of organized crime and the organized crime of politics: a study in criminal power*, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Schulte-Bockholt, A. (2013) *Corruption as power: criminal governance in Peru during the Fujimori Era (1990–2000)*, Bern: Peter Lang.

Schulte Nordholt, H. (1991) 'The Jago in the shadow: crime and "order" in the colonial state in Java', *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs*, vol. 25, no. 1, 74–91.

Schulte Nordholt, H. (2002) 'A genealogy of violence', in Colombijn, F. and Lindblad, J.T. (eds), *Roots of violence in Indonesia: contemporary violence in historical perspective*, Leiden: KITLV Press, 33–60.

Schulte Nordholt, H. and Till, M. van. (1999) 'Colonial criminals in Java, 1870–1910', in Rafael, V.L. (ed.), *Figures of criminality in Indonesian, the Philippines and colonial Vietnam*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 47–69.

Sen, A. and Pratten, D. (2007) 'Global vigilantes: perspectives on justice and violence', in Sen, A. and Pratten, D. (eds), *Global vigilantes*, London: Hurst & Company, 1–24.

Setiawati, I. (2010) 'Forced evictions leave Betawi out of work', *Jakarta Post*, 3 July.
Shahab, Y. (2000) 'Aristocratic Betawi: A challenge to outside perceptions', in Grijns, K. and Nas, P.J.M. (eds), *Jakarta-Batavia: socio-cultural essays*, Leiden: KITLV Press, 199–210.
Shelley, L.I. (1999) 'Transnational organized crime: the new authoritarianism', in Friman, R. and Andreas, A. (eds), *The illicit global economy and state power*, New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 25–51.
Sidel, J.T. (1999) *Capital, coercion and crime: bossism in the Philippines*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Sidel, J.T. (2006) *Riots, pogroms, jihad: religious violence in Indonesia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Siegel, J.T. (1998) *A new criminal type in Jakarta: counter-revolution today*, Durham: Duke University Press.
Silver, C. (2007) *Planning the megacity: Jakarta in the twentieth century*, London: Routledge.
Simanjuntak, M. (2007) *Preman-preman Jakarta*, Jakarta: Pensil-324.
Simone, A. (2010) *City life from Jakarta to Dakar: movements at the crossroads*, New York: Routledge.
Simone, A. (2013) 'Cities of uncertainty: Jakarta, the urban majority, and inventive political technologies', *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 30, no. 7–8, 243–263.
Smail, J.R.W. (1964) *Bandung in the early revolution 1945–1946: study in the social history of the Indonesian revolution, Modern Indonesia Project*, New York: Cornell University.
Solahdin *et al.* (2001) *Pro Gus Dur runs amok: a report on violence towards journalists and mass media May 2000–April 2001*, Jakarta: Aliansi Journalis Indonesia.
Spinoza, B. (1951) *A theological-political treatise and a political treatise*, New York: Dover Publications.
Stanley, W. (1996) *The protection racket state: elite politics, military extortion, and civil war in El Salvador*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Stirk, P.M.R. (1992) *Max Horkheimer: a new interpretation*, Lanham: Barnes & Noble.
Stoler, A.L. (1988) 'Working the revolution: plantation laborers and the People's Militia in North Sumatra', *Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. 47, no. 2, 227–247.
Subianto, P. (1995) 'Pencak silat dalam kaitan dengan ketahanan nasional, bela negara dan Sishankamrata', document produced for National Sporting Pencak Silat Trainers and Referees Course, Jakarta, 12–19 November.
Supriatma, A.M.T. (2014) 'Defending murder', *Inside Indonesia*, no. 115, January–March, at www.insideindonesia.org/current-edition/defending-murder (accessed 18 July 2014).
Sutherland, H. (1979) *The making of a bureaucratic elite: the colonial transformation of the Javanese Priyayi*, Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann Educational Books.
Taylor, M. (1982) *Community, anarchy, liberty*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Till, M. van (1995) 'In search of Si Pitung: the history of an Indonesian legend', *Bijdragen KITLV*, vol. 152, no. III, 462–481.
Tilly, C. (1975) 'Reflections on the history of European state-making', in Tilly, C. (ed.), *The formation of nation states in Western Europe*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3–83.
Tilly, C. (1985) 'War making and state making as organized crime', in Evans, P.R., Ruesdchemeyer, D. and Skocpol, T. (eds), *Bringing the state back in*, London: Cambridge University Press, 169–191.

Tilly, C. (2003) *The politics of collective violence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tjandraningsih, I. (2012) 'State-sponsored precarious work in Indonesia', *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 57, no. 4, 403–419.
Trocki, C.A. (1998) 'Democracy and the state in Southeast Asia', in Trocki, C.A. (ed.), *Gangsters, democracy, and the state in Southeast Asia, Southeast Asia Program Publications*, Ithaca: Cornell University, 7–16.
Turpin, E., Bobbette, A. and Miller, M. (eds) (2013) 'Urban water politics in Jakarta: an interview with Abdou Maliq Simone', in *Jakarta: Architecture + adaptation*, Depok: Universitas Indonesia Press, 61–101.
Varese, F. (2001) *The Russian mafia: private protection in a new market economy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Varese, F. (2011) *Mafias on the move: how organized crime conquers new territories*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
Vickers, A. (2005) *A History of Modern Indonesia*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
Volkov, V. (2002) *Violent entrepreneurs: the use of force in the making of Russian capitalism*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Voorst, R. van (2014) 'Hope, cynicism and Jokowi in a Jakarta slum', *New Mandala*, 16 April, www.asiapacific.anu.edu.au/newmandala/2014/04/16/hope-cynicism-and-jokowi-in-a-jakarta-slum/ (accessed 6 November 2014).
Wandelt, I. (2007) 'Prabowo, Kopassus and East Timor: on the hidden history of modern Indonesian unconventional warfare', in Streifeneder, E. and Missbach, A. (eds), *The presence of the past: a festschrift in honour of Ingrid Wessel*, Berlin: Regiospectra, 121–147.
Weber, M. (1964) *The theory of social and economic transformation*, trans. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, New York: Free Press.
Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and society*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Weber, M. (1991) *Essays in sociology*, London: Routledge.
Wee, V. and Jayasuriya, K. (2002) 'New geographies and temporalities of power: exploring the new fault lines of Southeast Asia', City University of Hong Kong Working Paper Series, no. 30.
Weisel, D.L. (2002) *Contemporary gangs: an organizational analysis*, El Paso: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
Williams, M.C. (1990) *Communism, religion, and revolt in Banten*, Center for International Studies, Ohio University.
Wilson, I.D. (1999) 'Reog Ponorogo: spirituality, sexuality and power in a Javanese performance tradition', *Intersections: Gender, History and Culture in the Asian Context*, no. 2, www.intersections.anu.edu.au/issue2/Warok.html (accessed 6 November 2014).
Wilson, I.D. (2008) 'So long as it's halal: Islamic preman in Jakarta', in Fealy, G. and White, S. (eds), *Expressing Islam: Islamic life and politics in Indonesia*, Singapore: ISEAS Press, 192–210.
Wilson, I.D. (2012) 'Testing the boundaries of the state: Gangs, militias, vigilantes and violent entrepreneurs in Southeast Asia', in Robison, R. (ed.), *Routledge handbook of Southeast Asian politics*, London: Routledge, 288–301.
Wilson, I.D. (2014) 'Morality racketeering: vigilantism and populist Islamic militancy in Indonesia', in Boo Teik, K., Hadiz, V. and Nakanishi, Y. (eds), *Between dissent and power: the transformations of Islamic politics in the Middle East and Asia*, Palgrave Macmillan, 248–274.

Wilson, L. and Nugroho, E. (2012) 'For the good of the people? The challenges of governing "societal organisations" pose difficult questions for Indonesian democracy', *Inside Indonesia*, no. 109, July–September at www.insideindonesia.org/weekly-articles/for-the-good-of-the-people (accessed 5 May 2014).

Yunanto, S. (2009) *Reformasi kepolisian Republik Indonesia: baru janji, belum bukti*, Jakarta: Lesperssi.

Zhu, J. (2010) 'Symmetric development of informal settlements and gated communities: capacity of the state: the case of Jakarta, Indonesia', Asia Research Institute Working Paper Series, no. 135.

Index

1945 Constitution 43, 58, 156
1997 economic crisis 55, 71, 72, 75, 97, 102

AAK (Anti-Communist Alliance) 76, 87
Abrahams, Ray 30
Ajidarma, Seno Geno 74
Al-Zastrouw, Ngatawi 157
Amirullah, Haji 120, 135, 138
AmKey (Association of Central Moluccan Youth in Jakarta) 86
AMPI (Golkar youth organisation Indonesian Youth Renewal Generation) 41, 57, 58, 59
AMS (Siliwangi Youth Generation) 41, 58, 93
Anderson, Bobby 96
Anis gang 67–8, 69, 85
Ansor 19, 40, 76, 145
Aspinall, Edward 95, 149
Assabdu, Kasmiri 46
authoritarian/totalitarian regime 21, 163, 174; protection racket regime 10, 56; *see also* repressive regime
Azhar, Andi 148, 165
Aziz, Abdul 101

Badjoeri, Harianto 53, 81, 82, 89, 120
BAIS (Armed Forces Strategic Intelligence Agency) 67, 84
Baker, Jacqui 115, 137
BAKIN (National Intelligence Agency) 41
Bamus (Betawi Consultative Body) 102, 108–109, 113, 120, 149, 150; elite Betawi 108
Banser 76, 145, 146
Barker, Joshua 15, 22, 30, 40, 49, 95, 119
Barrios, Luis 32, 36
Batalas, Achilles 8
beking (backing) xx; gangs/state relationship xix–xx, 17, 31, 53, 55, 66, 69, 114–15; Suharto's racket regime 52–5, 56, 61; Tanah Abang *preman* 63, 80, 83
Bella Eymus, Seno 55, 60
Bertrand, Romain 11, 35, 108
the Betawi xx, 70, 76, 79, 81, 99–113; Betawi groups 110, 111; Betawi identity 99–102, 107–108, 110, 139; Betawi organisations 102–103; *Betawi Pinggir* 28, 101–108 *passim*, 111; ethnicity 33, 110; indigenous population of Jakarta xx, 28, 82, 90; legitimacy 33, 70; marginalisation 28, 99, 100, 104, 110; 'naturalising' as Betawi 123–4; New Order 100–101, 102; PPP 100–101; social welfare 32; territorialisation 33; *Tramtib* 82, 83, 122; working class 28, 99, 102, 110; *see also Bamus*; *Betawi Kota*; Betawi Movement; FBR; *Forkabi*; Jatibunder gang; Ucu, Bang
Betawi Kota 100–101, 102, 104, 108
Betawi Movement 79
Black Eagles 116, 130–5, 136; Aa 131–5, 141; a FBR branch 131; IKB 134–5; Marta 131–2, 133, 135; MetroMini 133, 134, 136; police/Black Eagles relationship 116, 133–4, 136
Blok, Anton 19
Bourchier, David 50, 58
Bowo, Fauzi 109, 113, 137, 149–50; 'anti-preman' campaign 117
Brigass 164
Brotherton, David C. 32, 36, 95
Buehler, Michael 92, 94

Cakung 103–104, 105, 106, 112, 126, 127
Castells, Manuel 139
Chosiyah, Ratu Atut 58, 93
Christianity 160, 174; 2000 Christmas Eve church bombings 145, 164; Christianisation 153–4
Cimahi gang 44, 57
civil society 21, 56, 117
class divide 25–7, 62, 128, 154–5; class resentment 23, 29, 31, 62, 102, 106, 110 (FPI 153, 157, 163); middle-class 97, 101, 173; *see also* the urban poor; working class
coercion xviii, 2, 170; coercive governance xviii; legitimacy 2, 4; New Order xix, 37; political violence and coercion xxi; post-New Order xix; protection racket regime 3, 9; *see also* violence
communism 16, 54, 55, 76, 108, 156, 160, 174
corruption 2, 23, 69, 115; defining element of the racket system 38; police 48, 50, 59, 77, 88, 96, 137; *Tramtib*, violence, brutality and corruption 80–1
Cribb, Robert 12, 14, 48
crime 117; Suharto's racket regime 47–55; the urban poor 97
criminality: gang/gangster 95–6; *preman* 39, 171; protection racket, a criminal extortion 96, 97; state xix–xx, 17, 31, 37; Suharto's racket regime 37, 39; *see also* legal/illegal ambiguity
crisis of hegemony 8, 15, 16, 18, 23, 28, 61, 82

Daradjatun, Adang 149, 150
Day, Tony 6
debt collection 34, 81, 107, 124, 125, 130, 140, 173
decentralisation and regional autonomy xviii, 24, 25, 28, 33, 80, 91–4, 114–15, 170; communal conflict 92; ethnicity 92, 93; indigenism 62, 90, 98; Jakarta 97–9; local elections 92; localism 62, 90, 92, 93, 98; *pemekaran* 33, 92; populist racketeering 172; post-2002 groups/organisations 98–9; realignments and competition 91, 92, 99; social and political context 91–2
dedengkot 120, 121, 138
democracy: FPI, democracy as *haram* 144, 155; gang/gangster xviii, xxi, 11 (beneficiaries of democratic electoral politics 2, 24, 94); Guided Democracy 15, 40; a means to undemocratic ends 163; militia xviii, xxi; multi-party democracy xvi, xviii, 2, 20, 24, 170; *preman* xviii, 25; protection racket regime 10; 'stagnating' process of democratisation 22; violence xviii, 173; *see also* elections; multi-party electoral democracy and protection racket
Djamin, Awaloedin 49, 50
Djojohadikusumo, Hashim 157

East Timor: Hercules 66–7, 69, 84, 159; Subianto, Prabowo 159
El-Muhir, Fadloli 36, 102, 104, 106, 112, 113, 119; multi-party electoral democracy 147, 149–50
elections xviii; 1971 election 41, 42, 48; 1977 election 41, 48, 100, 111; 1982 election 48, 111; 1997 election 60; 1999 election xvi, 144, 167; 2004 election 146, 147; 2007 election 150; 2009 election 147, 148, 167; 2014 election 147–8, 149, 155–6, 165, 167, 173–4 (Subianto/Hercules relationship 144, 157–63); absence of direct elections for mayors 148, 164; 'festivals of democracy' 41, 143; Gerindra 159–60; Golkar 41, 57, 100, 111, 143; removing direct elections 147, 164; vote buying 149, 159–60, 165; *see also* democracy; FBR and elections in Jakarta; multi-party electoral democracy and protection racket
Elias, Norbert 43–4, 45
employment 105, 106, 107, 125, 126, 146, 166; job-seeker programmes 32, 127; provision of job 32, 65, 77 (FBR 123, 129, 130, 141, 149, 150)
ethnicity xx, 33, 90, 130, 171; the Betawi 33, 110; decentralisation and regional autonomy 92, 93; ethnic identity 14, 21, 33, 62, 93, 100, 128; ethnicised mass organisations as vehicle of the underclass 94–7; FBR 106, 107, 109, 110; New Order 100, 101; *see also* indigenism

Farid, Hilmar 37
Fauzi, Gamawan 31, 156

FBR (Betawi Brotherhood Forum) xx–xxi, 79, 103–110, 170, 172; Betawi–Madurese tensions 105–106, 126; differences/similarities with New Order organisations 91; ethnicity 106, 107, 109, 110; FBR's declaration 103–104; franchise-like system 110, 122, 130–1, 171; institutionalisation 121, 138–9; legitimacy 90; local parochial identity 107–108, 110; mediation between kampung and the state 91, 110, 119; politics: oppositional, pragmatic and opportunistic 110, 170; post-New Order 94, 107, 110, 170; *preman* 90–1; protection 91, 96, 109, 110, 119, 171; riots in Koja 89; RT/RW system 123, 139, 147, 148, 164; 'state-ness' 36; Subianto, Prabowo 162–3, 169; territorial organisation 120–1 (*gardu* 107, 120–1, 138); UPC 108, 112, 113; vigilantism 31; *see also the entries below for* FBR
FBR and elections in Jakarta 144, 147–51; appeal to political parties 148–9; DPD/Regional Representative Council 147–8; participation and representation 147–8, 163; *see also* FBR; multi-party electoral democracy and protection racket
FBR, membership xx–xxi, 33, 23, 106–107, 109, 112, 117–18, 122–3, 135–6; benefits for members 127–30, 135, 143, 170; the largest *preman* organisation in Jakarta xx; provision of jobs 123, 129, 130, 141, 149, 150; reasons for affiliation 123, 127–8; recruitment 122, 129; *see also* FBR
FBR, populist political agency 91, 103–104, 106, 109, 110, 127–30, 170–1; advocacy 91, 111; defending communities from encroachment or eviction 91, 119, 123, 126–7, 138, 140, 147; purpose of FBR 90, 103–104; *see also* FBR
FBR, structural organisation 119–20; *dedengkot* 120, 121, 138; intelligence agents 138; Pitung 120; women's division 140; *see also* FBR
FKGMB (Youth Generation Betawi Communication Forum) 79
FKPPI (Forum of the Sons and Daughters of Retired Military) 41, 53
Forkabi (Betawi Communication Forum) 31, 79, 81, 82, 88, 90, 109, 171; founding committee 104; membership 118
FPI (Defenders of Islam Front) xxi, 36, 93, 151, 172; appeal to political parties 157; democracy as *haram* 144, 155; enforcement partnerships 152–3; Islam 151, 153; membership 23, 118; political party 155–6; politics of resentment and morality racketeering 151–7, 163; protection 96; right-wing nationalist 156, 167; urban poor and working class 153, 157; vigilantism 31, 151
franchising: gang franchising 10, 25, 110, 122–3, 125, 130, 171; state franchising 50, 52–3, 56
Frederick, William 14
FSPMI (Indonesian Federation of Metal Workers' Unions) 130, 148

G4S Security 115
Gada Paksi (Youth Guard Upholding Integration) 65, 158
gali 16, 19, 48; Petrus operation/mysterious shootings 50–2, 59
Gambetta, Diego 34
gang/gangster xxi, 13; a challenge to the authority of the police and the military 48–9, 50; criminality 95–6; democracy xviii, xxi, 11 (beneficiaries of democratic electoral politics 2, 24, 94); gang franchising 10, 25, 122–3, 125, 130; gangs/state relationship xix–xx, 7–10, 17, 31, 53, 55, 66, 69, 114–15; membership 49; migration 27; origins 27; private security services 48–9; protection 96, 115; a social organisation 95; sub-contracted violence xix; Suharto's racket regime 40–1; the urban poor 27, 35, 36; vehicle for the struggles of the urban underclasses 95; wars between gangs 71–2, 105–106, 124–7, 132, 139–40, 171; *see also jago*; *preman*; *satga*
gardu 107, 120–1, 138
Gerindra 72, 150, 156–62 *passim*, 164; vote buying 159–60; *see also* Subianto, Prabowo
Golkar xvii; elections 41, 57, 100, 111; SatKar Pendekar 47; thugs 41, 76; *see also* Suharto

governance: coercive governance xviii; good governance 22, 28, 92, 104; racket governance 116–19; vigilantism as local governance 30
GRIB (People's Movement for a New Indonesia) 150, 159–62, 168, 169
Gunawan, F. X. Rudy 22

Habibie, Bacharuddin Jusuf xvi, 70
Hadiz, Vedi R. 21, 22, 24, 93, 173
Hafidz, Wardah 80, 108, 112, 113
Hagedorn, John M. 23, 128
Hakim, Lutfi 97, 104, 109, 118, 119–20, 123; *Imam Rempug* 119; multi-party electoral democracy 147–8, 151, 171
Hamid, Abdul 22
Hatta, Mohammad 13
Hercules 27, 35, 63–72, 73, 74, 81, 83, 84, 86, 107, 116, 117, 124; East Timor 66–7, 69, 84, 159; fall of 71–2, 81, 83, 86, 139; GRIB 150, 159–62, 168, 169; Kopassus 67, 69, 84; the military 66; the name 84; *preman* 85; Soares, Manuel 66–7; Subianto, Prabowo 65, 66, 69, 72, 157–63 (Hercules' arrest and imprisonment 161–2); Tanah Abang empire 67–8; *Tramtib* 81–2; *see also* Tanah Abang *preman*
Heryawan, Ahmad 155, 167
Hess, Henner 9
HKBP (Batak Protestant Parish) 154
Horkheimer, Max 10, 20, 38, 56, 93
Humphrey, Caroline 17

identity: Betawi identity 99–102, 107–108, 110, 139; communal identity 128, 146; ethnic identity 14, 21, 33, 62, 93, 100, 128; FBR, local parochial identity 107–108, 110; identity politics 32–3; legitimizing identity 121, 139; local identity xx, 90, 93; national identity 98; religious identity 33, 128
ideology 32; Archipelago Concept/ *Wawasan Nusantara* 43, 57; ideological loyalty 61; Pancasila 21, 45, 156; thugs 41; state ideology 5, 16, 21, 29, 42, 45, 58, 66, 90, 156; violent entrepreneurship 21
Idris, Fahira 155, 167
Ikamra (Family of Madura Association) 86
IKB (*Ikatan Keluarga Betawi*) 31, 134–5, 142
IKBT (Family of Tanah Abang Association) 70–9 *passim*, 81, 83, 86, 87, 103; fracturing of the IKBT coalition 73–4, 75; a new paradigm 72–4, 83; *see also* Tanah Abang *preman*
indigenism 62–3, 82, 83; decentralisation and regional autonomy 62, 90, 98; post-New Order 98; *see also* ethnicity
Indo, Johnny 111
Indonesia, protection racket regime 10–18; colonial regimes 11–13; New Order *preman* 15–18; post-independence Jakarta 14–15; post-New Order 18; revolution and independence 13–14, 19; *see also* protection racket regime
Indonesian Corruption Watch 150
Indonesian Independent Journalists Alliance 144
informal street economy 10, 23, 27, 75, 80, 82, 95, 98, 102, 127; eviction 27, 80, 85, 94, 122, 123, 126–7, 140; *preman* 64; raids, attacks, harassment 64, 76, 82, 89, 121–2; *Tramtib* 80–2; *see also* the urban poor
IPK (Association of Functional Group Youths) 41
IPKI (Association for the Supporters of Indonesian Independence) 15
IPSI (Ikatan Pencak Silat Indonesia) 42–3, 57, 58, 112, 158, 168
Islam 31; the Betawi 100; FPI 151, 153; *habib* 151, 166; *kyai* 100, 102, 104, 106, 119, 132, 154, 160; political Islam 33; religious education 100; *ulama* 46, 100, 102, 160
Iwarda 100–101

jago (social bandit) xx, 13–15; colonial regimes 11–13; guerrilla 13; *jago* republics 13, 14; nationalism 42; nested system of *jago*s 16; pencak silat 11, 42; *see also* gang/gangster; *satga*
Jakarta xxii, 1, 20, 64, 83, 171, 173; decentralisation and regional autonomy 97–9; elites 99; greater Jakarta/Jabotabek 26, 101; Jakarta resident 111; nationalist urbanism 97, 99; socio-economic divide 25–7; urbanisation 100, 101
Jatibaru gang 67, 70, 71, 73–4, 87: IKJB 74
Jatibunder gang 67, 69, 71, 73–4, 85

jawara (champions/martial arts experts) 22; *pendekar* 46, 58; PKI 13; SatKar Pendekar 46–7, 58
Jayasuriya, Kanishka 62
Jessop, Bob 8
justice 3–4; racket system 38

Kahfi, Abdul 68, 70, 72, 74
Kamra 35, 77
Kapak Merah (Red Axe) 36
Kei, John 27, 35, 81, 86, 89, 107, 116, 124, 139, 160
Kei, Tito 124, 139, 161
kesatria 46, 58
King, Phil 144, 164
Klinken, Gerry van 92, 104
KNPI (Indonesian National Youth Committee) 41, 58, 150, 165
Kobra 14
KONI (Indonesian National Sports Commission) 45
Kopassus 67, 69, 84, 158, 172
KPU (Indonesian Electoral Commission) 146
Kreuzer, Peter 28
kriminalitas 48, 51, 59
Kusno, Abidin 62, 97

land, use and ownership of 125–6; land brokering 34, 81, 126
Lane, Frederic 5, 34
Lane, Max 173
laskar (militia/militia member) 14; *see also* militia
Latin America 7, 9, 95
law: 2003 National Employment Law 129; illegality 27; KPU Decision No. 7/2004: 146; law enforcement 173; laws regulating societal organisations 117, 137; Police Law No.2 2002: 116; racket system 38; rule of law 173; state 4
legal/illegal ambiguity 4, 8, 116; New Order xvii, xix, 39, 50
legitimacy: the Betawi 33, 70; coercion 2, 4; FBR 90; legitimizing identity 121, 139; New Order 40, 48; *preman* 24, 28–31, 72, 76, 83; protection racket regime xix, 172; Tanah Abang *preman* 63, 83; vigilantism and morality racketeering 24; violence, power and legitimacy 2–5
Lindsey, Timothy 15, 16–17, 21, 38–9, 56, 69
'local king' 16, 28, 56
localism xx, 33, 82, 90, 93, 98, 110, 171; decentralisation and regional autonomy 62–3, 90, 92, 93, 98; ethnicised localism 74; local politics xviii; post-New Order 98
Lucas, Anton 13
Lunggana, Abraham 79, 87, 88, 103, 124, 138, 171; Jakarta regional parliament 100, 111; PT Sacom 118; Putra Perkasa 70, 78, 118

MacDougall, John M. 22, 145
the Madurese: Betawi–Madurese tensions 105–106, 126; 'Madura problem' 104, 105; Madurese gangs 66, 67, 74, 79, 104–107, 112, 131, 132, 141, 161
mafia and organised crime 8, 34; elimination of 10; Japan 9, 16, 49; *preman* 21; Sicily 9, 16, 34, 49, 56, 149; repressive regime/organised crime relationship 9, 38; Russia 9, 116; *see also* gang/gangster
Makarim, Zacky Anwar 66, 84
maksiat (vice) 31, 151
marginalisation 171; the Betawi 28, 99, 100, 104, 110
Masaaki, Okamoto 2, 22
Masyumi 19
Matrik (District Civil Defence Unit) 72–3, 75, 77, 87
media 21–2, 48, 59, 77, 96, 117, 143
Meliala, Adrianus 22, 111
mercenary 11, 19
Migdal, Joel 4–5, 19, 21, 38
migration to urban areas 26, 58, 79, 83, 98, 100, 101–102; 'Betawi-isation' of new migrants into Jakarta 101; gang/gangster 27; marginalisation and attacks 108; mass evictions and criminalisation 98; restricting migration into the capital 64, 75
the military: attack, abduction, torture of opponents 55, 60; Hercules 66; militarisation of social and cultural organisations 43; pencak silat 45; Petrus operation/mysterious shootings 51, 59; police/the military institutional separation 34, 115, 137; post-New Order 18; *preman* 22; protection racket and state formation 6–7; protection racket regime 115; soldier/thug distinction xvii; sport/

militarism connection 42; sub-contracted violence xix; Suharto's racket regime 38, 40, 56; training and support of thugs 40, 41; use of force 4
militia xxi, 13, 19, 114–15, 171; challenge to 173; democracy xviii, xxi; doctrine of territorial warfare 19; *see alsolaskar*; *Pamswakarsa* militias; party paramilitaries; *satga*
Moerdani, Benny 48, 50, 51
morality racketeering 24, 30–1; FPI 151–7, 163
multi-party electoral democracy and protection racket xxi, 119, 143–69, 170; democracy, a means to undemocratic ends 163; FBR 144, 147–51; FPI 151–7, 163; gang/gangster, beneficiaries of democratic electoral politics 2, 24, 94; local political parties 148, 164–5; party paramilitaries 144–6, 163; political capital 119; political violence xxi, 136, 145, 163; populist democratic politics 144, 163; PP 145, 164; protection 145, 149; Subianto, Hercules and the 2014 presidential election 144, 157–63; vote buying 149, 159, 165; *see also* democracy; elections
Murtopo, Ali 40, 41, 46–7, 48, 52, 57, 58, 59

Nahdatul Ulama 40, 76, 104, 132–3
Nalapraya, Edi Marzuki 43, 50, 57, 79, 102, 104, 109, 112
Nasution, Abdul Haris 14–15, 19
nationalism 98, 174; FPI 156, 167; *jago* 42; nationalist urbanism 97, 99; pencak silat 43, 45, 57
New Order: Archipelago Concept/ *Wawasan Nusantara* 43, 57; beginnings 40–2; the Betawi 100–101, 102; coercion, violence and power xix, 37; 'divide and rule' style 41; end of 24; ethnic identity and cultural practices 100, 101; legal/illegal ambiguity xvii, xix, 39, 50; legitimacy 40, 48; precariousness 17; *preman* 15–18, 21, 56 (connotations of criminality and violence 39; *preman* state 61); repressive/totalitarian regime 38, 56; state violence 37; sub-contracted violence xix, 56; *see also* Suharto; Suharto's racket regime
NGO (non-governmental organisation) 36, 51, 79, 96, 111
Nordholt, Schulte 11
Nugroho, Eryanto 173

O'Rourke, Kevin 84
oligarchy 24
opposition: attacks against and intimidation 41, 53, 54–5, 66, 76
OPSUS (Special Operations Command) 41
ormas (societal organisation) 32, 36, 96, 115, 116; immunity 117; mediation between kampung and the state 108; use value 146, 171; *see also* FBR; *Forkabi*; FPI; gang/gangster; PP; *preman*; protection racket
OTB (Organisations Without Form) 16–17

Pak Ogah (informal traffic warden) xvii, 73, 75–6, 95, 97, 127
Pamswakarsa militias 22, 35, 70, 93, 103, 151
PAN (National Mandate Party) 109, 132, 148, 164
Pancasila 21, 45, 156
party paramilitaries 144–6, 163; 1999 election 144; a challenge to the police and the military 145; KPU Decision No. 7/2004: 146; opportunism 146; *see also* multi-party electoral democracy and protection racket
Patria, Nezar 22
PD Pasar Jaya 64
PDI (Indonesian Democratic Party) 57; 27 July attack on 54–5, 60, 69, 72
PDI-P (Democratic Party of Struggle) 55, 76–7, 160; party paramilitaries 144, 145; *posko* xvi; *see also* Sukarnoputeri, Megawati; Widodo, Joko
pecalang (traditional security guards) 93
pemekaran 33, 92
pencak silat xvi; competitive 'sport' version 43, 44–5, 57, 58; grading system 45, 58; *jago* 11, 42; the military 42, 45; nationalism and militant patriotism 43, 45, 57; silat pledge 45, 58; state ideology 45, 58; Suharto 43, 45 (IPSI 57); Suharto's racket regime 42–6

Pendekar Banten 93
Perbepsi 14
Petrus operation/mysterious shootings 50–2, 56, 59, 79, 172
the Philippines 16, 28, 36, 56
PI (Special Forces) 14, 19
Pinkerton 115
Pitung, Si 65, 90, 106, 120, 151, 166
PKB (National Awakening Party) 73, 117, 144, 146, 164
PKI (Indonesian Communist Party) 13, 19, 37, 46, 48, 87
PKS (Islamist Prosperity and Justice Party) 82, 164, 165
PM (*Pemuda Panca Marga*) 31
PMKS (social welfare problems) 117
PNI (Indonesian Nationalist Party) 19
police: 'anti-preman' campaign 35, 77–8, 88, 117, 137; corruption and inefficiency 48, 50, 59, 77, 88, 96, 137; enforcement partnerships 116, 125, 133, 138, 150, 173 (FPI 152–3; police/Black Eagles relationship 116, 133–4, 136); Petrus operation/mysterious shootings 51; Police Law No.2 2002: 116; police/the military institutional separation 34, 115, 137; protection 115; semi-privatisation of 34, 115; use of force 4; *see also* Satpol PP; Tramtib
political capital 155; *jago* 12–13; morality racketeering 31; multi-party electoral democracy 119; *preman*/violent entrepreneurship 20, 22, 24–5, 116, 143
politics: identity politics 32–3; liberalisation of the political system xix; local politics xviii; political rally 128, 140, 165; political violence xxi, 136, 145, 163; violent entrepreneurship and local political prominence 22, 25, 29, 31, 94, 123, 143; *see also* democracy; elections; multi-party electoral democracy and protection racket; protection racket
populism 16, 29, 143, 144, 163, 173–4; the Betawi 102; FBR 106–107; populist democratic politics 144, 163; populist political agency 20, 91, 94–5, 171; populist racketeering 170, 172, 173; *see also* FBR, populist political agency
posko/*pos komando* (command post) xvi, 120, 138
post-New Order 1, 170; coercion, violence and power xix; FBR 94, 107, 110, 170; indigenism 98; localism 98; the military 18; multi-party electoral democracy 2; *preman* 1, 18, 21–2; proliferation of organised *preman* and rackets 18; protection racket regime 18, 170, 172; sub-contracted violence xxi, 23; violent entrepreneurship 18
poverty 128; New Order 48; *see also* the urban poor
PP (*Pemuda Pancasila*) 19, 31, 52, 59, 61, 99, 107, 111; attacks by 55, 60, 130 (1965–66 massacres 40, 57); criminalisation 50; democratic electoral politics 145, 164; IPKI 15; Patriot Party 164
PPM (Panca Marga Youth) 41, 53, 61, 67, 70, 81, 82, 87, 107, 171
PPP (United Development Party) 57, 73, 100–101
Pramoedya Ananta Toer 63
PRD (People's Democratic Party) 54, 59, 60, 67, 87
preman (thug, gangster) xvi–xviii, 1; adjusting to social and political changes 22, 24–5, 61–3, 82, 110, 171, 174; an alternative form of social structuration 33; 'anti-preman' campaign 35, 116–17 (police 35, 77–8, 88, 117, 137; Sutiyoso's 'anti-preman' campaign 74–9, 83, 88); corporatisation and institutionalisation 47, 52–3, 78, 121, 138–9, 172; definition xvii, 110; informal street economy 64; legitimacy 24, 28–31, 72, 76, 83; a mafia 21; the military 22; New Order *preman* 15–18, 21, 56 (connotations of criminality and violence 39; *preman* state 61); political capital 20, 22, 24–5, 116, 143; post-New Order 1, 18, 21–2; *preman*, state and society relationship xix, 39, 75, 82, 83; rents/payment to 15, 53, 59 (Tanah Abang *preman* 67, 73, 75–6, 84–5); research on 21–2; rivalry and competition 35, 56, 61, 71, 73, 74, 82, 87, 104–105, 107, 124, 170; soldier/thug distinction xvii, 39; urbanisation, exclusion and the search for security 24, 25–8; *vrijman* xvii, 12; *see also* gang/gangster; *ormas*; protection racket; Tanah Abang *preman*; violence

premanisme 15, 22, 127, 139
protection 5–7; double-edged nature of 5, 16, 38, 96, 110; protection as a tradable commodity 34; state 6–7, 37–8, 51–2; violence and protection 5–6, 37–8; *see also* protection market; protection racket
protection market 34–5, 82, 107, 118, 172, 173; managing protection markets 114–16; middle class and elites 173; rivalry and competition 35, 56, 61, 71, 73, 74, 82, 87, 104–105, 107, 124, 170
protection racket xix, 171; archetype of domination 10, 136, 172, 174; criminal extortion 96, 97; definition 6, 34; enforcement partnerships 115, 116, 125; FBR 91, 96; FPI 96; gang/gangster 96; gang franchising 10, 25, 122–3, 125, 130–1; modes of expansion 121–4, 130–1, 135–6; organising territory 119–21; points of conflict and violence 125–7; political economy of xxi, 114–42, 171–2; racket governance 116–19; reasons for affiliation 123; *see alsothe entries below for* protection racket; protection; protection market; racketeering
protection racket regime xix, 9; authoritarian/totalitarian regime 10, 56; challenge to 173; coercion 3, 9; democracy 10; FBR 91, 96, 109, 110, 119, 171; gang/gangster 96, 115; inverse racketeering 8; legitimacy xix, 172; the military 115; an organisational strategy 10; post-New Order 18, 170, 172; social welfare 23, 24, 31–2, 35, 91, 133; society of rackets xix, 17, 35, 38; state, gangs and racket regimes 7–10; 'state-ness' 35, 36, 171, 172; *see also* Indonesia, protection racket regime; multi-party electoral democracy and protection racket; protection racket; Suharto's racket regime
protection racket, services offered 171; FBR, appeal to political parties 148–9; FPI, appeal to political parties 157; services offered to clients 34, 125–6 (contract enforcement 34, 173; debt collection 34, 125, 140; land brokering 34, 126, 140; protection 34, 126); *satga*, use value xvi, 146, 171; services offered to members 127–30; *see also* FBR, membership
PT Bass 115
Purnama, Basuki 147, 165

racketeering: challenge to 173; defining elements of the racket system 38; elimination of 10; populist racketeering 170, 172, 173; the racket, definition 38, 67; *see also* protection racket; protection racket regime
Ramli, Nahrowi 79, 120, 150
repressive regime: New Order 38, 56; repressive regime/organised crime relationship 9, 38; *see also* authoritarian/totalitarian regime
Rismaharini, Tri 155
Rizieq, Habib 153, 155, 156, 166, 167
Robinson, Geoffrey 19
Robison, Richard 21, 22, 24
Rodgers, Dennis 7–8
Rozaki, Abdur 2, 22
RT/RW system 123, 139, 147, 148, 164
Ryacudu, Ryamizard 70, 86
Ryter, Loren xvii, 14, 16, 22, 39, 40–1, 52, 66, 93–4, 143

Sabeni, Haji 65, 70, 86
Sadikin, Ali 27, 64, 100
Sánchez-Jankowski, Martin 29
Sangaji, Basri 81, 89, 116, 124, 139
Sangaji, Ongen 27, 35, 139, 161
Sassen, Saskia xviii
satga (task force) 13, 76, 164; paramilitary-style security wing xvi; political agency 171; proliferation and diversification xviii; rivalry xvii, xviii; use value xvi, 146, 171; *see also* gang/gangster; militia; party paramilitaries; *preman*
SatKar (working units) 46
SatKar Pendekar/Banten Pendekar Association 46–7, 58; PPSBBI 47
Satpol PP (Civil Service Police Unit) 80, 89, 114–15, 120, 137, 147
Schulte-Bockholt, Alfredo 8–10, 17, 28–9, 62, 82, 171–2; crisis of hegemony 8, 28
Securicor 115
Shelley, Louise 9
Sidel, John T. 28
Siegel, James T. 51, 59
Simone, AbdouMaliq 91, 93, 105, 110, 126

siskamling (environment security system) 49–50, 52, 54, 87, 120, 136, 171
Sjafe'i, Imam 14, 19
Sjafi'ie, Irwan 79, 88, 104, 112
SMI (Young Indonesian Warriors) 158, 168
SMID (Indonesian Students' Solidarity for Democracy) 54, 60, 67
Snyder, Justin 96
Sobirin, Tadjus 47
Sochib, Hassan 58, 93, 107
Sochib, Tubagus Chasan 46, 47
social sovereignty 7–8, 82, 91, 110–11
social welfare and political representation 23, 24, 31–2, 35, 91, 133
society of rackets xix, 17, 35, 38; *see also* protection racket regime
Soerjadi 54, 55, 60
Soerjosoemarno, Yapto 53, 59
Spinoza, Baruch 4
sport 43–4, 45; *olahraga* 57; *see also* pencak silat
SPRIM (Indonesians in Solidarity Struggle with the Maubere People) 66–7
Stanley, William 7
state 1–19; coercion xix; conflicts between different coalitions of state and social power 20–1; criminality xix–xx, 17, 31, 37; definition 3, 4, 5, 19; a franchise 50, 52–3, 56; gangs/state relationship xix–xx, 7–10, 17, 31, 53, 55, 66, 69, 114–15; ideology 5, 16, 21, 29, 42, 45, 58, 66, 90, 156; 'insecurity state' 56; loyalty to 21, 22, 37, 47, 52, 56, 61, 98, 101, 174; monopoly over force 3, 4–5, 38, 39; protection 6–7, 37–8, 51–2; sub-contracted violence xix, 3, 8, 23, 114–15; violence xix–xx, 37; violence and protection 5–6; violence and state formation 6–7; violence, power and legitimacy 2–5; violent entrepreneurship 7, 15, 56; war making and state making 6, 37; *see also* protection racket regime
street organisation 32, 36, 136
student activism 41, 48, 57, 85, 151
sub-contracted violence xix–xx, 37–60; colonial regimes 11; gang xix; martial arts group xix; the military xix; New Order xix, 56; post-New Order xxi, 23; state xix, 3, 8, 23, 114–15; *see also* violence; violent entrepreneurship
Subianto, Prabowo xxi, 60, 65, 66, 144, 156–7, 164; 2014 presidential election 144, 156, 157–63, 167, 174; counter-insurgency and unconventional warfare 158, 159, 161; discharge from the military 60, 157; East Timor 158; FBR 162–3, 169; Hercules 65, 66, 69, 72, 157–63; pencak silat 158; *see also* Gerindra
Sudomo 48
Suharto 17, 43, 48; mafia don 39; pencak silat 43, 45 (IPSI 57); resignation 62; sportsmanship 46, 58; *see also* Golkar; New Order; Suharto's racket regime
Suharto's racket regime xix–xx, 16–17, 37–60, 61, 136, 170, 172; arbitrary use of force 38; *beking* 52–5, 56, 61; bureaucracy 38; crime 47–55; criminality 37, 39; defining elements of the racket system 38; gangs 40–1 (disbandment of 40–1); *Golkar* 40; legitimate/illegitimate violence ambiguities 39, 50; the military 38, 40, 56; monopoly over force 38, 39; patron-client relations 55–6, 61; pencak silat 42–6; Petrus operation/mysterious shootings 50–2, 56, 59; SatKar Pendekar 46–7, 58; *siskamling* 48–50, 56; success 38; surveillance 38, 50, 61; threats 37, 38, 39; youth 40–2
Sukarno 13, 63; Guided Democracy 15, 40
Sukarnoputeri, Megawati xvi, 54–5, 59–60, 103, 113, 145, 159
Sumitro 41
surveillance 38, 50, 61, 123, 171
Sutarto, Endriartono 145
Sutiyoso 59, 60, 69–70, 98, 114, 149; 'anti-preman' campaign 74–9, 83, 88, 117, 172; attack on UPC 108, 112
Syukur, Abdul 108–109

Tanah Abang *preman* xx, 63, 65–89; *beking* 63, 80, 83; 'community partner' with government 63, 83; consolidation and legitimation 63, 83; *preman* and the policing of public order 79–82; private enterprise 63, 78, 80, 83; protector of local communities 63, 76, 80; rents/payment to 67, 73, 75–6, 84–5; Sutiyoso's 'anti-preman' campaign 74–80, 83, 88; *Tramtib* 68,

77, 81, 82, 83, 85; *see also* Hercules; IKBT
Tantono, Harry 124, 160
Taylor, Michael 4
Tedjowulan, Prince 160, 168
territorialism 32–3, 171; FBR, territorial organisation 120–1 (*gardu* 107, 120–1, 138)
Tiara programme 65, 66, 158; Rukmana, Tutut 65
Tilly, Charles 1, 3, 4, 5–7, 8, 16, 17, 37–8, 134
Tjokropranolo 43, 102
trade union 23, 95, 130, 148, 171; outsourcing 129–30
Tramtib (Peace and Order Guard) 80, 89; the Betawi 82, 83, 122; Hercules 81–2; informal street economy 80–2; Tanah Abang 68, 77, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85; violence, brutality and corruption 80–1
Trihatmojo, Bambang 57, 58
Trocki, Carl A. 11

Ucu, Bang 70–1, 74, 76, 77, 86, 88
UPC (Urban Poor Consortium) 80, 108, 112, 113
the urban poor 27, 64, 75, 98, 174; crime 97; FPI 153, 157; involvement in gangs or mass organisations 27, 35, 36; war against the poor 117; *see also* class divide; informal street economy; working class
urban slum 22, 23, 25–6, 63, 102, 126
urbanisation 26–7, 101, 153; exclusion and search for security 24, 25–8; Jakarta 100, 101
use of force: the military 4; police 4; state, monopoly over force 3, 4–5, 38, 39; Suharto's racket regime and arbitrary use of force 38; *see also* violence

Varese, Federico 34, 116
vigilantism xx, 30–1, 93, 95, 115, 171; FPI 31, 151
violence 136; 1965–66 massacres 6, 40, 42, 57; 1974 January Disaster 41; 1996 27 July attack on PDI 54–5, 60, 69, 72; 1998 May riots 55, 67, 73, 97–8, 158; 2000 Christmas Eve church bombings 145, 164; communal and inter-neighbourhood violence 62, 105; democracy xviii, 173; illegitimate non-state violence 4; Jakarta 173; New Order, legal/illegal violence ambiguities 39, 50; non-state violence 2; political power 5; political violence xxi, 136, 145, 163; specialists in violence 1, 18–19; state violence xix–xx, 37 (violence and state formation 6–7; war making and state making 6, 37); *Tramtib*, violence, brutality and corruption 80–1; violence and protection 5–6, 37–8; violence, power and legitimacy 2–5; wars between gangs 71–2, 105–106, 124–7, 132, 139–40, 171; *see also* sub-contracted violence; use of force; violent entrepreneurship
violent entrepreneurship 1, 19, 173; consolidation of political power 15, 116; definition 19; ideology 21; market for 34–5; organisational strategies 34–5; political capital 20, 22, 24–5, 116, 143; post-New Order 18; prominence on the local political/administrative stage 22, 25, 29, 31, 94, 123, 143; state's social order 7, 15, 56; *see also preman*; sub-contracted violence
Volkov, Vadim 4, 6, 7, 19, 96, 115
Voorst, Roanne van 163

Wahid, Abdurahman 60, 76, 103, 144, 145
Wandelt, Ingo 158
warok 18, 19
Weber, Max 3, 4–5, 19, 30
Wee, Vivienne 62
Wekan, Siwo 123–4
Widodo, Joko 89, 113, 123, 140, 150–1, 160, 166, 169, 173–4
Wilson, Lee 173
Winata, Tomy 86, 88, 125, 159, 166
Wiranto 69, 77, 103, 151
Wongsonegoro 43, 57
working class 20, 21, 25, 29, 98, 173; the Betawi 28, 99, 102, 110; FPI 153, 157; *see also* class divide; informal street economy; the urban poor

youth 171; unemployment 128; Suharto's racket regime 40–2
Yudhoyono, Susilo Bambang 117, 159, 161, 164, 167

Zhu, Jieming 26

Murdoch

UNIVERSITY

Gangs and militias have been a persistent feature of social and political life in Indonesia. During the authoritarian New Order regime they constituted part of a vast network of sub-contracted coercion and social control on behalf of the state. Indonesia's subsequent democratisation has seen gangs adapt to and take advantage of the changed political context. New types of populist street-based organisations have emerged that combine predatory rent seeking with claims of representing marginalised social and economic groups.

Based on extensive fieldwork in Jakarta, this book provides a comprehensive analysis of the changing relationship between gangs, militias and political power and authority in post-New Order Indonesia. It argues that gangs and militias have manufactured various types of legitimacy in consolidating localised territorial monopolies and protection economies. As mediators between the informal politics of the street and the world of formal politics they have become often influential brokers in Indonesia's decentralised electoral democracy. More than mere criminal extortion, it is argued that the protection racket as a social relation of coercion and domination remains a salient feature of Indonesia's post-authoritarian political landscape.

This ground-breaking study will be of interest to students and scholars of Indonesian and Southeast Asian politics, political violence, gangs and urban politics.

Ian Douglas Wilson is a Lecturer in Politics and Security Studies at the School of Management and Governance, and a Research Fellow at the Asia Research Centre, Murdoch University, Australia.

Cover image: © Ian Douglas Wilson

an **informa** business

ISBN 978-1-138-30252-5

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
www.routledge.com

9 781138 302525

Routledge titles are available as eBook editions in a range of digital formats